SEE FOLLOWING NOTE

VOIR NOTE CI-APRÈS

PARTS OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT ARE OF POOR REPRODUCTIVE QUALITY.

MICROMEDIA LIMITED HAS ATTEMPTED TO PRODUCE THE BEST POSSIBLE COPY.

CERTAINES PARTIES DU DOCUMENT ORIGINAL SONT DE PIÈTRE QUALITÈ DE REPRODUCTION.

MICROMEDIA LTEE A ESSAYEE DE PROCURER LE MEILLEUR EXEMPLAIRE POSSIBLE.

NO
PAPER
RIGHTS

REIMPRESSION
INTERDITE

... unites Ontario's municipalities

Waste Management Series 1990

"Municipal Solid Waste Management: Whose Problem Is It?"

Association of Municipalities of Ontario
August 1990

MISSION STATEMENT

AMO unites Ontario's municipalities.

We take pride in promoting, supporting and enhancing strong and effective municipal government.

We provide strategic leadership by:

- developing and effectively promoting responsive quality policy;
- informing and educating governments, the media and the public;
- marketing innovative and beneficial services.

Our elected representatives, municipal officials and association staff form a team which values and respects:

- diversity and local autonomy;
- fairness and equity;
- consultation;
- consensus;
- co-operation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 5

OVERVIEW 6

PART I: FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

ROLES 8

ACTIVITIES 8

1. Environmental Strategy 8
2. "4Rs" Waste Minimization Hierarchy 12
3. Research and Development 13
4. National Resource Centre 14
5. Procurement Policies 15
6. Labelling 15
7. The National Packaging Protocol 16
8. The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy 18

FEDERAL FUNDING 19

PART II: ONTARIO GOVERNMENT

ROLES 21

ACTIVITIES 21

I. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPACT THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT AND GENERAL POPULATION 22

1. Municipal Solid Waste Reduction Goals 22
2. "4Rs" Waste Minimization Hierarchy 23
3. Ontario's Waste Abatement Strategy 24
4. The Ontario government's advisory committees 25
   a) The Recycling Advisory Committee 25
   b) The Ontario Round Table on the Environment and the Economy 26
5. Waste Audits and Procurement Policy 26

II. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPACT MUNICIPALITIES 28

1. Communication 28
2. Master Plans 30
3. The Environmental Assessment Act 31

III. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPACT INDUSTRY 32

1. Waste Composition Study 32
2. National Packaging Protocol 33
3. Ontario's Blue Box Recycling Program 34
4. Soft Drink Container Legislation 37

IV. PROVINCIAL FUNDING 40

V. ENERGY-FROM-WASTE 44

PART III: MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

ROLES 46

ACTIVITIES 47

1. Delineating Responsibilities 47
2. Developing an Integrated Solid Waste Management Program 50
3. Waste Audits 51
4. Procurement Policies 52
5. Material Bans at Landfills 52
6. Private Landfills 53
7. Inter-municipal Solid Waste Management 54

COSTS 55

FUNDING 55

1. Tipping fees 56
2. User fees 57

PART IV: INDUSTRY

ROLES 58

ACTIVITIES 58

1. The Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI) 58
2. National Packaging Protocol 59
3. Advisory Committees 59
4. Waste Audits 60
5. Introduction of the "4Rs" 60
6. Procurement Policies 62

PROVINCIAL FUNDING OF INDUSTRY 62

PART V: THE PUBLIC

ROLES 63

ACTIVITIES 63

PART VI: DEFINITIONS 65

TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS 66

APPENDIX A: FEDERAL PROGRAMS 76

APPENDIX B: PROVINCIAL FUNDING PROGRAMS 78

APPENDIX C: MINORITY REPORTS FROM AMO'S COMMITTEES 86

ENDNOTES 90

BIBLIOGRAPHY 90

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 91

MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT WHOSE PROBLEM IS IT?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Municipal Solid Waste Management: Whose Problem Is It? is the third report in The Association of Municipalities of Ontario's (AMO) waste management series. It examines the roles, responsibilities, cost and funding of all of the players now involved with solid waste management. This involves the federal, provincial and municipal governments as well as industry and consumers.

Each sector is studied in a section of this report. In each section, the report looks at what the sector now is doing regarding roles in, and funding of, municipal solid waste management. Then, to promote a better system of solid waste management, the report offers recommendations for improvements or new areas which that sector could address.

Throughout the report, AMO calls for the major players to adopt the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling, and recovery of energy-from-waste. It also encourages them to adopt comprehensive procurement policies which promote goods and services favoring the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" hierarchy. AMO also urges most of the parties to conduct waste audits to reduce their own solid waste generation.

In the first section of the report, AMO makes several recommendations to the federal government. AMO asks the federal government to develop a federal waste management strategy. It also asks the federal government to both expand its "EcoLogo" program and include in this program labels which indicate whether a material should be reused, recycled, treated as a hazardous waste, or disposed of in an environmentally safe manner. AMO asks the Canadian Council of Ministers on the Environment to use the National Packaging Protocol as a model to address other components of the municipal solid waste stream. It also asks for municipal representation at the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, which is addressing solid waste management matters traditionally managed by municipalities.

Also in this section, AMO asks the federal government to establish a national resource centre for solid waste management information and to increase funding to agencies carrying out programs of national significance related to solid waste. AMO also states the federal government should promote a Canadian environmental industry and conduct more research and development projects for environmental issues and technologies crossing provincial and international boundaries. AMO then asks the federal government to make advances from these latter two areas available to municipalities.

In the second section of the report, AMO recommends that the Ontario government use the Environmental Assessment process to develop generic guidelines relative to waste diversion for municipalities. It asks the province to adopt and publish an official policy, or pass legislation, which formally enshrines its provincial waste diversion goals - something which the province has not yet done. Once this is done, AMO asks the province to develop methods to record progress toward these goals and develop, in concert with municipalities, implementation guidelines to meet these targets. AMO then asks the province to specify what percentage of the waste diversion goal it will take sole responsibility for.

In this section of the report, AMO calls for the province to develop solid waste management policy through consultation and with discussion papers, and then legislation and regulations, rather than through press release as it has been doing. It asks the province to include municipalities in industry-provincial discussions of municipal waste minimization strategies. It also asks the province to continue to assist with the development of markets for recyclable materials and to ensure the province and industry provide long-term funding for the Blue Box recycling program which they initiated.

In a major part of this section, AMO asks the province to reject the Recycling Advisory Council's recommendation to eliminate the provincial requirement for soft drink producers to provide at least 30 per cent of the products in refillable containers. It also asks the province to encourage reuse as an important waste management component and to encourage people to be more aware that recyclable bottles are better for reuse. AMO also says the province's Ministry of Environment should strengthen the regulations requiring soft drink containers to be refillable, extend these regulations to cover all beverage containers, and ensure a deposit system is instituted for all beverage containers.

Finally, AMO recommends in the provincial section that when the provincial government is developing its share of the National Packaging Protocol strategy, it should include a municipal government representative on its multi-stakeholder advisory group, and introduce regulations to ensure the Protocol's targets for reducing packaging waste are met. AMO also says the province should clarify its stand on energy-from-waste and extend the time for which it will fund energy-from-waste projects. Finally, AMO says the province should release its waste composition study and also fund the hiring of a municipal solid waste management information co-ordinator to improve communication among municipalities and between municipalities and the provincial government.

In the third section of the report, which deals with municipal governments, AMO says all municipalities should introduce an integrated solid waste management plan which incorporates the "4Rs" of the waste minimization hierarchy as well as the more traditional activities of collection and disposal. It says municipalities should investigate co-operative ventures - such as joint boards of management - to implement integrated waste management programs in their areas.

AMO also says municipalities should include in audits of their waste management systems information to provide them with a true cost accounting of their solid waste management system. All Ontario municipalities should then set their tipping fees so these reflect the total life-cycle cost of operating their solid waste management systems. Once that is done, AMO says the revenue from tipping fees should be dedicated to fund the municipalities' integrated waste management system.

Early in this section of the report, AMO also recommends that municipalities and the province review, and make necessary changes to, the legislation governing municipalities to address a variety of municipal concerns in the solid waste management area. This review, and the ensuing changes, should also ensure that municipalities are given the authority to implement the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of energy-from-waste.

To better manage the solid waste stream, AMO says Ontario municipalities should be given authority to approve the establishment and continued use of private waste disposal systems in their jurisdictions. Then, for municipal bans of materials at landfills, AMO says municipalities should aid waste haulers and their customers to find "4Rs" alternatives for their materials. Once that is done, municipalities should give commercial waste haulers sufficient notice that the ban is going to be implemented, and then ban the dumping of recyclable materials in their landfills where appropriate markets for these goods are available.

In the industry section of the report, AMO makes the same requests of industry as it has of the various government levels. It asks industries to conduct waste audits of their operations to reduce the solid waste which they produce. It urges them to develop comprehensive procurement policies which promote goods favouring the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of energy-from-waste. It also asks industries to reduce solid waste generation by introducing a "4Rs" waste minimization program to minimize the solid waste they produce in their operations. Finally, AMO asks industries to redesign their products to increase their durability, longevity, and ability to be repaired and thus minimize the solid waste produced by consumer-used goods.

In the final section, the public is encouraged to become partners in the management of municipal solid waste. AMO asks members of the public to find ways to reduce their share of the waste stream in their homes and their offices. They can practice most of the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy by finding ways to reduce, reuse and recycle products. AMO also encourages members of the public to explore ways they can become part of the solution to the problem which now exists in the waste management area.

INTRODUCTION

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) represents more than 700 of Ontario's 839 municipalities. During the late 1980s, AMO began to receive urgent appeals from its members, many supported by council resolutions, for help to deal with what was becoming, for many, a solid waste management crisis. Various governments and industries had been making advancements in this area, but more developments were needed if Canadians were not soon to be confronted with a solid waste management crisis. In early 1988, AMO's Board of Directors made municipal solid waste management a policy priority, and the association formed a waste management sub-committee.

Working through this waste management sub-committee, AMO has reviewed Ontario municipalities' solid waste management concerns and published two reports calling for action. The Waste Management Planning and Approvals Process was published in March 1989 and The Municipal Waste Abatement Strategy was published in November 1989.

This is the third report of the AMO waste management series. Called Municipal Solid Waste Management: Whose Problem Is It?, the report looks at the roles, responsibilities, costs and funding of all the players now involved with solid waste management. That includes the federal, provincial and municipal governments as well as industry and consumers.

Each sector is studied in a section of this report. In each section, the report looks at what the sector now is doing regarding roles in, and funding of, municipal solid waste management. Then, to promote a better system of solid waste management, the report offers recommendations for improvements or new areas which that sector could address.

Municipal solid waste management is a rapidly changing area, and now is the time to look at how the problems in it can be addressed. In presenting this report, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario hopes to help to establish a new framework to effectively address how Canadians manage their garbage.

OVERVIEW

Canadians produce more garbage per person than people in any other nation. That was the sobering fact disclosed by a 1989 survey conducted by the Washington Analysis Corporation for Environment Canada. According to the survey, Canadians produce an average of 1.7 kilograms of garbage per person per day. That's more garbage per person than is produced by Americans, Australians, West Germans, the Swiss, or the British. It is more than double the 0.8 kilograms of garbage each Swede produces per day, and more than triple the 0.5 kilograms of garbage each Chinese produces per day.

We do not need to be told that is not a good record, but we do need to examine why we hold that dubious distinction. Like many other industrialized nations, Canada has had growing concerns about how it manages its municipal solid waste stream. Until recently, we put our garbage bags on the curb, or took them to the landfill, and expected them to disappear. But now we are beginning to realize everything disposed of in our homes, offices, restaurants, shops, and industries goes into a Canadian incinerator or landfill.

This is no longer an acceptable solution for managing our solid waste. The landfills we once took for granted are filling up or being closed to protect the environment. New ones are becoming increasingly difficult to site as people oppose them, saying "Not in my back yard", and we become more conscious of the environmental hazard they represent. Various reports and agencies are warning that if we want to protect our planet, we cannot keep using and disposing of our resources at the rate we have been.

This means we need to develop a new way to handle our municipal solid waste. Until now, it has been a municipal government concern to collect and dispose of solid waste in municipal landfills. But with the increasing pressures, municipalities have been changing their solid waste management methods. Provincial and federal governments have also begun to be concerned with how municipal solid waste is managed. Industry and consumers are rethinking what they throw out. Reduce, reuse, recycle and recover energy-from-waste are becoming the catchwords of the 1990s.

This concern is not happening too soon. Environment Canada reports that the 1.7 kilograms of garbage we each produce daily means Canadians produce 16 million tonnes of municipal solid waste per year. That is only residential, commercial and light industrial solid waste. If we count the amount of heavy industrial waste produced, our Canadian solid waste output is between 35 million and 40 million tonnes per year. That figure does not include mine tailings and pulp waste.

In Ontario, the picture is no brighter. Ontario's Ministry of the Environment estimates people in Ontario produce 3.74 million tonnes of residential waste and 5 million tonnes of industrial waste per year. Another 1.16 million tonnes of hazardous waste is also produced by industry each year.

We produce one tonne of garbage per household every year in Ontario, and that's far too much. It is a grim picture and one more communities are studying. Southern Ontario communities are already struggling with the question of where their garbage should go. Communities in less populated areas may not be at that point yet, but they are feeling the pressure of tightening and costly environmental standards and growing public concern.

Before the picture grows any bleaker, or more communities begin to face crises, Canadians have an opportunity to examine how we manage our municipal solid waste. Governments and industries which have not been involved in municipal solid waste management are beginning to address how they contribute to the problem and what they can do about it. People and enterprises which have been part of the problem now are saying they want, or must, become part of the solution. More governments, industries and consumers need to do the same. If we all participate, we can all be part of the solution to the solid waste management problem.

Municipalities are the most direct deliverers of public services. The "good ideas" of the public and other government levels frequently depend on municipal governments to make them work or find ways to put theory and policy into practice. Municipalities realize, however, that if they are to be a major player in a complex problem, they must be involved at an early stage with the other "partners". Unless roles, responsibilities and financial obligations are clearly spelled out and accepted by all at the outset, everyone involved in waste management will again experience frustrations.

This report presents a synopsis of what the federal, provincial, and municipal governments in Ontario are doing about solid waste management. It also looks briefly at what industry and consumers do in this area. It makes several recommendations regarding what each party can do to improve its solid waste management. Municipal Solid Waste Management: Whose Problem Is It? is a look to the future. With good planning and management by all government levels, industry and consumers, we can make Canadian municipal solid waste management a model for the future.

PART I

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

ROLES:

The Canadian government has traditionally not been involved in issues impacting municipal solid waste management. Until recently, the area has been a provincial responsibility and, in Ontario, municipalities have had legislative authority for municipal solid waste collection and disposal. However, as more concern has focused on environmental issues, the federal government has become increasingly involved in this area. It has initiated, or participated in, several activities which could impact on the amount and type of waste entering the municipal solid waste stream. The federal government has also started to fund some programs which impact this area. In early 1990, indications were that federal involvement in areas affecting municipal solid waste management could increase. When Lucien Bouchard, former federal Minister of the Environment, released The Green Plan: A Framework for Discussion on the Environment in March, he wrote in its introduction, "In the 1990s, the Government of Canada is determined to consolidate this leadership role in the field of environment."

ACTIVITIES:

While the federal government has not yet adopted any policy framework or legislation to deal with municipal solid waste management, it has been active on a variety of fronts which could impact the amount of waste being produced.

1. Environmental Strategy:

To date, the Canadian government has not developed any policies which reduce the amount of waste flowing into the municipal solid waste stream. In March 1990, Lucien Bouchard, former federal Minister of the Environment, released The Green Plan: A Framework for Discussion on the Environment. It outlined federal concerns, questions and activities in a wide range of environmental areas, including waste management. This 31-page discussion paper forms the basis of consultation sessions which the federal government plans held across Canada during mid-1990. Later this year, the federal government is expected to release The Green Plan: A National Challenge, which is to "describe some of the programs, laws and other actions the Government will implement in order to address those problems."*1*

The Green Plan: A Framework for Discussion on the Environment notes in its waste management section that Canadians produce more waste per person than citizens in any other country. It also says Canada has a poor recycling record and Canada's environment ministers have agreed to a national goal of reducing waste generation by 50 per cent by the year 2000. The Green Plan states governments, industries and individuals must explore the best ways to achieve that target. But, it adds that while "local and provincial governments have a major role in waste management, the (federal) Government is interested in finding new ways to facilitate co-operative action and to encourage waste reduction and recycling."[2]

The federal government proposes to establish an Office of Waste Management to expand the national waste exchange program and promote waste reduction and recycling. Other options it says it could explore are mandatory recycling, educational measures and pricing to reduce waste. Having noted that even if the 50 per cent target is met, half our waste will still need disposal, it asks for ideas on how governments can site waste management facilities while still addressing Canadians' concerns regarding those sites. While the Canadian government has been preparing this stance, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has issued a much more comprehensive federal strategy for solid waste management. In February 1989, it published The Solid Waste Dilemma: An Agenda for Action, written by the Municipal Solid Waste Task Force, which was created by the EPA in February 1988. An Agenda for Action calls for all government levels, industry and consumers to address the U.S.'s solid waste management concerns. In particular, it calls for a complementary program of source reduction, reuse, recycling, combustion and landfills and "a fundamental change in the nation's approach to producing, packaging and disposing of consumer goods."[3]

While Canada's The Green Plan does not give specifics about what the federal government would do regarding solid waste management, the EPA's An Agenda for Action does. It proposes several ways of reaching its goal of decreasing the country's solid waste by 25 per cent by 1992 through source reduction and recycling. Among the EPA's ideas are:

- adopting an integrated waste management hierarchy of source reduction (including reuse), recycling, landfilling and combustion;
- reducing industry, government and local waste;
- adopting federal procurement policies which favour products with source reduction attributes;
- developing projects for separating recyclables in federal agencies;
- having state and local governments encourage recycling, conduct waste exchanges, and provide incentives for stable markets for recycled goods;

- having industry conduct waste audits to find ways to decrease the volume and toxicity of materials used in manufacturing;

- encouraging industry's efforts for recycling plastics;

- having the EPA study ways to reduce lead and cadmium in products, and foster recycling of lead-acid batteries;

- having the EPA identify economic, regulatory and possibly legislative incentives for decreasing waste volume and toxicity;

- having the EPA foster the formation of regional marketing councils to exchange market information;

- stimulating and stabilizing markets for secondary materials and recycled goods. The EPA would conduct market development studies for different commodities and examine economic and regulatory incentives for using secondary or recycled materials;

- developing a peer matching program to allow all levels of government and waste management to exchange expertise;

- establishing a national clearinghouse of information;

- developing a national research agenda for collecting new information and developing new technologies;

- forming a National Recycling Council with representatives of all waste management sectors to track recycling issues and problems and recommend actions;

- composting yard waste.

Canada would be well served by such a comprehensive federal strategy on solid waste management. This could expand on areas the federal government is already working on, such as a National Packaging Protocol to reduce packaging waste, and address a large range of other solid waste management issues from a national perspective. Some of the areas this strategy could address include:

- establishing a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order. This could be applied to reducing the amount of solid waste produced by the federal government and its commissions, boards, agencies and crown corporations;

- having industry conduct waste audits to find ways to decrease the volume and toxicity of materials used in manufacturing;
- making it mandatory for companies doing business with the federal government to use a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order, for their solid waste;
- studying markets and identifying and implementing market development strategies for recycled goods and reusable materials;
- promoting reduction at source of all waste materials, and penalizing those industries and businesses which do not comply;
- funding research which promotes the recycling or reduction of materials not already identified;
- studying financial incentives which encourage the "4Rs" treatment of solid waste, particularly by industry;
- discouraging the proliferation of disposable items and requiring that all new disposable products be non-toxic and/or recyclable;
- developing national guidelines for compost and composting facilities.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

a. The federal government should develop, in concert with representatives of other government levels and waste generators, a comprehensive national program to support the management of solid waste.

b. Representatives of the municipal sector of government should be included in the multi-party working group which develops this program.

2. "4Rs" Waste Minimization Hierarchy:

The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) in April 1989 set a national goal of reducing Canada's waste generation by 50 per cent from the 1988 levels by the year 2000. CCME consists of Canada's federal, provincial and territorial environmental ministers, and its action has since been adopted by Environment Canada, and the Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia governments.
CCME's goal does not specify how that waste reduction will be achieved. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario believes those targets should be accomplished through the use of a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy. This hierarchy specifies that waste will be diverted from landfills through reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order.

The federal government should adopt this "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy to accompany its waste reduction targets so those striving to meet its targets may have direction as to how that waste reduction should be achieved. It should also encourage, as part of this hierarchy, programs which promote the reduction and reuse of materials which would otherwise be considered as waste. Once these are done, the federal government should then help to develop markets for recyclable materials. For that, it is important that the federal government develop a mechanism for marketing recyclable materials for small generators and small municipalities.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The federal government should:

a) adopt a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery to accompany its waste reduction targets;

b) encourage, as part of this hierarchy, programs which promote the reduction of materials which would otherwise be considered as waste;

c) help to develop markets for recyclable materials and mechanisms to ensure those markets.

3. Research and Development:

Six years ago, the federal government launched its National Incinerator Testing and Evaluation Program (NITEP) to address the impact which incinerator emissions and ashes pose to health and the environment. Through NITEP, Environment Canada worked with industry, municipal and provincial governments, and international organizations to study energy-from-waste incineration and emission control technologies. NITEP aimed to define the best design and operating conditions to minimize or eliminate incinerator emissions of concern. To that end, it studied three types of incinerator technologies, two types of emission control technologies, and the characteristics, utilization and disposal properties of the incinerator ashes.

Working under the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, NITEP developed a national guideline which, at the time of this report, was being incorporated under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act as a federal regulation. That regulation should give those building energy-from-waste facilities guidelines on how to design the best type of facility.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario applauds the federal government for its work in this area and encourages it to move forward with similar initiatives aimed at protecting the environment. Information provided by such programs as NITEP and its resulting regulations is useful to municipalities, and other similar endeavours should be undertaken by the federal government. AMO would particularly like to see the federal government conduct more research and development projects for environmental issues which cross provincial and international boundaries.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

> The federal government should conduct more research and development projects for environmental issues and technologies which cross provincial and international boundaries. Information from these projects should be disseminated to municipalities.

For the past year, Industry, Science and Technology Canada has had an Environmental Industries and Projects Division working to develop a Canadian environmental industry. If successful, it will give municipalities more access to Canadian environmental technology for work with solid waste. The division's three activity areas are:

- compiling a directory of Canadian companies which could provide technology to address environmental concerns both in Canada and abroad;

- seeking companies' proposals on Canadian markets for environmental products. The division is particularly interested in finding ways to help industry eliminate its waste and linking smaller companies with new ideas to manufacturers;

- identifying environmental technology gaps and helping Canadian companies license American and European imports for use here.

RECOMMENDATION #4:

The federal government should promote a Canadian environmental industry and make the technological advances available to Canadian municipalities.

4. National Resource Centre:

Considerable information on solid waste management now is available, but those wishing to access it find that difficult as it is scattered among agencies, government levels, consultants and academics. To help policy-makers define and implement their solid waste policies, it would help to have the information on solid waste management policies, strategies, research, financial incentives and disincentives, statistics, waste audits, waste stream composition, and the effectiveness of different reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery technologies all available from one body.

This body could be a national resource centre, funded and staffed by the federal government. It would collect, compile, and catalogue appropriate information in this area and disseminate information to those wishing to access this data.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

The federal government should establish a national resource centre which would allow those interested in this area to access all available information on solid waste and its management from one central source. This centre should collect, compile and catalogue appropriate information in this area and disseminate information on its inventory to those wishing to access this.

5. Procurement Policies:

The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) in April 1989 set a national goal of reducing Canada's waste generation by 50 per cent from the 1988 levels by the year 2000. In order to meet these goals, governments are encouraged to adopt procurement policies which promote goods and services favouring the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" of the waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. As major purchasers, governments which adopt such procurement policies can: a) serve as an example to other institutions or businesses, b) reduce their own waste stream, and c) provide larger markets for recycled materials. To be most effective and long-lasting, these procurement policies should be enacted in legislation. They should also apply to all federal departments, agencies, boards and crown corporations.

RECOMMENDATION #6:

The federal government should adopt comprehensive procurement policies which promote goods and services favouring the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy. These procurement policies should apply to all federal departments, agencies, boards and crown corporations and be enacted in legislation.

6. Labelling:

Environment Canada began its Environmental Choice program, which places its "EcoLogo" of three doves entwined into a Maple Leaf shape on approved products, in the summer of 1988. Since then, the Canadian Standards Association has been contracted by the federal government to assess and license those products which fulfil its "EcoLogo" requirements.

Manufacturing companies which pay a licensing fee, have their products tested, and meet the generic guidelines developed by Environmental Choice may use the "EcoLogo" for up to three years. Their products may be tested annually during that time to ensure they meet updated guidelines.

The "EcoLogo" denotes products which have an environmentally safe component, such as using a recycled product in their content. By March 1990, Environmental Choice had developed guidelines for ten product categories and former federal Environment Minister Lucien Bouchard had announced the first ten products licensed

under the program. These were: two brands of recycled motor oil, a brand of cloth diapers, three brands of water-based paints, two types of cellulose insulation made from recycled paper, a brand of recycled paper and a type of fencing made from recycled plastic. This is a good beginning, but the "EcoLogo" program should be expanded to cover products from more industrial sectors.

The "EcoLogo" briefly describes why the product is an "Environmental Choice". This may help consumers in purchasing decisions, but it does not provide information relevant to the product's disposal. What would help there is an addition to the Environmental Choice "EcoLogo" which tells consumers what to do with the product once its use is finished. This additional information could alert consumers to whether the product can be reused, recycled, treated as hazardous waste, or disposed of in an environmentally safe manner.

RECOMMENDATION #7:

The federal government's Environmental Choice "EcoLogo" program should be expanded and should also include a label which indicates whether a material should be reused, recycled, treated as a hazardous waste, or disposed of in an environmentally safe manner.

7. The National Packaging Protocol:

The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) in April 1989 set a national goal of reducing Canada's waste generation by 50 per cent from the 1988 levels by the year 2000. That action by CCME, which consists of Canada's federal, provincial and territorial environmental ministers, has since been adopted by Environment Canada, and the Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia governments.

To help meet that goal, CCME formed a national packaging task force to suggest ways in which packaging waste could be reduced. CCME had been told that the packaging industry preferred one national policy on packaging waste reduction rather than one policy for each province or territory. Research done for the task force also indicated packaging waste forms a major part of the solid waste stream. It stated that Canadians produce 5.7 million tonnes of packaging waste per year. That constitutes about one-half of the waste stream by volume, and one-third by weight.

The task force, composed of representatives from all government levels, the packaging industry, and environmental protection organizations, began meeting in May 1989. In March 1990, it brought its National Packaging Protocol proposals to CCME. CCME agreed to adopt a series of recommendations to reduce the amount of packaging thrown away in 1988 by: 20 per cent by December 31, 1992, 35 per cent by December 31, 1996, and 50 per cent by December 31, 2000. Half the cuts would come through recycling and half from using less packaging and more reusable items. By the end of 1990, every province is to gather detailed information about the kind of packaging disposed of in recent years. Then, each province is to develop and pass regulations to guarantee those cuts will be made. Companies are to be allowed to meet the targets voluntarily. But regulations are to be developed to enforce the protocol targets if companies do not voluntarily meet them.

RECOMMENDATION #8:

The federal and provincial governments should regulate firm dates by which the National Packaging Protocol's targets must be met by companies and enforce compliance.

AMO applauds the federal and provincial governments and industries which have agreed on the National Packaging Protocol to reduce packaging waste by certain amounts over certain time periods. This model can be used to promote the reduction of other parts of the municipal solid waste stream. Similar processes could thus be established to address other waste stream components, such as fine paper, magazines and advertising flyers.

RECOMMENDATION #9:

The Canadian Council of Ministers on the Environment (CCME) should use the National Packaging Protocol as a model to address other components of the municipal solid waste stream. A starting point for this could be fine paper, magazines and advertising flyers.

8. The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy:

The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy was established in October 1988 as a result of a chain of recommendations. In 1983, the United Nations formed a World Commission on Environment and Development. Headed by Norway's then Prime Minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland, this "Brundtland Commission" published a report, Our Common Future, in April 1987. It made several recommendations, but key was the idea that economic and social development in developing and industrialized nations must be based on "sustainable development". Sustainable development was defined as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."[4]

The Canadian government formed a National Task Force on the Environment and the Economy to look at how some of the Brundtland Commission's recommendations could be implemented in Canada. One of that task force's recommendations was to form a multi-sector round table which could advise the Canadian government regarding sustainable development. That was done in 1988, and by June 1989, the round table began meeting.

Composed of three federal cabinet ministers and representatives of academia, business and environmental protection groups, the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (NRTEE) has been looking at a wide range of issues. Among these, however, are several which could impact on municipalities and the municipal solid waste stream:

- NRTEE is working with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to develop a method for encouraging similar round tables at the municipal level;
- a NRTEE working group on waste reduction has written a report based on a sample of tipping fees for 39 Canadian municipalities. NRTEE would like to expand this study and have it published annually by a "partner" to urge an increase in municipal tipping fees and have these reflect true cost accounting of solid waste disposal;
- some NRTEE members are studying the option of energy-from-waste.

Other waste reduction plans NRTEE has prioritized for the future include:

- establishing a national recycling association;

- establishing a national recycling program across Canada by next year. While this would not be a uniform program for all communities across Canada, it would reflect the Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI) model, which has industry working with government to partially fund the introduction of Blue Box recycling programs in municipalities;

- encouraging industry to study a closed loop use of resources;

- urging the federal government to form a task force to study the elimination of barriers to recycling;

- encouraging a review of government taxation, policies and regulations at all government levels;

- urging government and industry to find safe ways to eliminate hazardous wastes.

Besides advising the federal government on issues which could impact the municipal solid waste stream, NRTEE also encourages its members to foster sustainable development principles among their sectors. This includes having these ideas forwarded to the federal cabinet and civil service. NRTEE also advised Lucien Bouchard, former federal Minister of the Environment, to adopt the consultative strategy he was using for his Green Plan discussion document.

RECOMMENDATION #10:

The municipal sector of government should be included as a member of the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy since it is addressing solid waste management matters which have traditionally been dealt with by municipalities.

FEDERAL FUNDING:

The federal Ministry of the Environment has traditionally said funding projects pertaining to the municipal solid waste stream is not in its jurisdiction. But it now funds two projects which can directly impact municipal solid waste management.

The Development and Demonstration of Resource and Energy Conservation Technology (DRECT) provides money to municipalities which meet the program criteria. Funded by Environment Canada and Energy, Mines and Resources Canada, it provides federal funds to develop new or innovative technology which recovers, recycles or reuses products from the waste stream. The project must also save energy.

The program began in about 1980 and in 1989/90 had a $1 million budget. Municipalities are eligible for funds if they have new projects which decrease pollution and recover energy. (See Appendix A for details).

The second project provides money to organizations which municipalities may be working with to operate solid waste management projects. The Environmental Partners Fund, funded by Environment Canada, provides federal funds to stimulate community involvement in projects which protect, preserve or enhance the environment. The funds are for community groups, service clubs, environmental organizations, schools and youth groups. Municipalities may work with these as a funding "partner". (See Appendix A for details.) The program began in 1989 and has a budget of $50 million for five years.

RECOMMENDATION #11:

The federal government should provide increased funding to those agencies which are carrying out programs of national significance related to solid waste.

PART II

ONTARIO GOVERNMENT

ROLES:

The provincial government plays a partnership role with the municipal sector in the management of Ontario's municipal solid waste. Working through the Ministry of the Environment, it has three functions:

1) to protect the environment and provide advice;

2) to legislate and regulate Ontario's solid waste management area and ensure provincial environmental rules are followed. It does this primarily by administering such acts as the Environmental Assessment Act and Environmental Protection Act, which deal with planning and approval of waste management sites and technical aspects of siting waste facilities;

3) to provide funding assistance to those who must meet its solid waste management goals.

ACTIVITIES:

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment's (MOE) roles have, in recent years, expanded into several activities which impact on municipal solid waste management. For the purpose of this report, those activities have been segregated into five categories: MOE activities impacting the Ontario government and general population, MOE activities directly impacting municipalities, MOE activities impacting industry, funding, and energy-from-waste.

I. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPACT THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT AND GENERAL POPULATION:

1. Municipal Solid Waste Reduction Goals:

In March 1989, the Ontario Environment Minister Jim Bradley, announced Ontario's goal was to divert 25 per cent of its household and commercial-industrial waste by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000. This was an announcement made in a press release and, to date, neither the Minister of the Environment or Ministry of the Environment have enshrined this goal in legislation, policy or regulations.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario is concerned that the Minister's targets of 25 per cent waste diversion by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000 were arrived at with no apparent public consultation. Public consultation is supposed to be a major thrust of the province's environmental protection legislation and AMO calls for the province to subject its targets to an Environmental Assessment Act assessment before they are introduced into official policy or legislation.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario urges the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) to adopt and publish an official policy, or pass legislation which enshrines its provincial waste diversion goals of reducing 25 per cent of its residential and commercial-industrial waste by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000. It also urges the MOE to develop methods to record progress toward these goals so municipalities know when they have reached the government's targets. Beyond that, AMO urges the MOE to state what year it plans to measure progress from and state what can and cannot be counted for meeting these diversion targets. The MOE should also have implementation guidelines to meet these targets, and these guidelines should be developed in concert with Ontario's municipalities.

AMO also urges the Ontario government to state what percentage of the waste stream target it will take sole responsibility for. Its waste diversion goal is 25 per cent by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000, but it has not said how much of that it will assume responsibility for. AMO urges the Ontario government to declare what percentage of those targets it will meet by reduction and reuse. It should not include in these calculations activities in which Ontario municipalities already are, or will be, partners. To meet its share of the target, the province should count the waste reduced by such activities as enforcement of the National Packaging Protocol's targets and its own government operations' waste stream reduction.

RECOMMENDATION #12:

The Ontario government should:

a) use the Environmental Assessment process, including public consultation, to develop generic guidelines relative to waste diversion for municipalities;

b) adopt and publish an official policy, or pass legislation which formally enshrines its provincial waste diversion goals;

c) develop methods to record progress toward these goals, state what the year of comparison is to be, and state what can and cannot be counted for meeting those diversion targets;

d) develop, in concert with municipalities, implementation guidelines to meet these targets;

e) specify what percentage of the waste diversion goal it will take exclusive responsibility for. This should only include the areas of reduction and reuse, and not include any activities in which Ontario municipalities are, or will be, partners.

2. "4Rs" Waste Minimization Hierarchy:

The Ontario Minister of the Environment, Jim Bradley, has stated Ontario's goal is to divert 25 per cent of its household and commercial-industrial waste by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000. However, he has not stated how those in Ontario are expected to reach those targets. The province's major efforts to date have concentrated on recycling, but the Association of Municipalities of Ontario believes the targets should be reached through the use of an integrated waste management system. To be most effective, this system must be built on the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy. This states waste will be diverted from landfills through reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order. Waste reduction means waste is prevented from entering the waste stream, reuse means an item can be reused so does not enter the waste stream (refillable beverage containers are one example), and recycling reintroduces material back into the production process.

The Ontario government should adopt this "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy to accompany its waste reduction targets so those striving to meet these know how that waste diversion should be achieved.

RECOMMENDATION #13:

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment should adopt a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order, to accompany its waste reduction targets.

3. Ontario's Waste Abatement Strategy:

The Ontario government has not issued a solid waste abatement strategy to explain how its waste reduction targets are to be met. In 1983, it released its Blueprint for Waste Management in Ontario, which noted the direction the province wanted to take regarding solid waste management. In it, the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery was to be part of a program to reduce waste going to landfills. More recently, the Minister of the Environment has made several announcements indicating the goals should be reached using reduction, reuse and recycling, but not recovery, which is defined as energy-from-waste. Meanwhile, the Ontario Ministry of Energy has a grant program to fund energy-from-waste facilities.

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment has been drafting a discussion paper to prepare for its solid waste abatement strategy. Once it is reviewed by five Ontario ministries, it is to be released for public comment.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario welcomes that discussion paper and urges the Ontario government to release it immediately for consultation. The strategy outlined in that paper should be based on the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy.

RECOMMENDATION #14:

The Ontario government should immediately release its solid waste abatement strategy for consultation.

4. The Ontario Government's Advisory Committees:

a) The Recycling Advisory Committee:

The Ontario government's Recycling Advisory Committee (RAC) was established by a provincial Order-in-Council in 1985. Its primary purpose was to advise the Ontario Minister of the Environment regarding the establishment of multi-material source separation programs and the Ontario regulations dealing with carbonated soft drink containers. A multi-stakeholder group, RAC has spent the past five years concentrating primarily on recycling. Discussions now are underway to expand RAC into RAC II. Its new mandate would be to deal with a total waste minimization strategy, including reduction, reuse and recycling, particularly of materials not now in Ontario's recycling program. Plans are to have RAC II address how this new strategy could be introduced to industry and institutions, and look at what more can be done with household hazardous waste.

AMO believes RAC's mandate, focus and membership have been geared toward recycling for so long that RAC now cannot shift to adequately reflect a broader waste minimization strategy. To more adequately integrate reduction, reuse and recovery into the province's waste minimization strategy, the Recycling Advisory Committee should be reconstituted with a new title, membership and mandate. Its mandate should be to advise the Minister of the Environment on all 4Rs--reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. The committee's membership should also be reconstituted so it is a multi-stakeholder group which reflects the "4Rs" hierarchy and includes AMO representation. The committee would report to the Minister of the Environment in a way similar to that which the Recycling Advisory Committee has been doing to advise him on recycling issues.

RECOMMENDATION #15:

The Ontario government should reconstitute the Recycling Advisory Committee with a new name, mandate and multi-stakeholder membership which reflects the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy.

RAC has also proposed to the Ontario government that a task force be formed to examine the question of "who pays" for our waste stream. Three topics which could be included in this examination are: a) full cost accounting of landfills, b) gross operating costs for collection and processing of recyclable goods, and c) a process for finding a long-term, equitable cost-sharing mechanism for industry, provinces and municipalities.

b) **The Ontario Round Table on the Environment and the Economy:**

The Ontario government has six cabinet ministers sitting on the Ontario Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (ORTEE). As with the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, which advises the federal government on matters pertaining to sustainable development, this multi-sector committee advises Ontario's Premier on matters pertaining to sustainable development.

The Ontario Round Table has 21 members, including several business representatives and Sylvia Sutherland, the Mayor of Peterborough and AMO's representative. Active for about one year, ORTEE has been making presentations on its mandate to a variety of groups. It also organized an Arbor Week across Ontario from April 27 to May 4, 1990. ORTEE has been planning a series of demonstration projects, including: a building which uses the principles of sustainability, use of low energy, high-efficiency light bulbs, a community forestry project, and encouragement of government procurement policies.

As with the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, ORTEE has also been urging municipalities to establish local round tables to promote activity in this area. It has made a presentation on its mandate and Arbor Week to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and it is preparing a paper with information on waste management which may have some recommendations pertaining to municipalities.

5. Waste Audits and Procurement Policy:

As with the federal government, the Ontario government is both a major product consumer and waste generator. To aid its reduction of solid waste, it should conduct a waste audit and introduce procurement policies.

A waste audit of the Ontario government would reduce and eliminate its solid waste. In its Industrial Waste Audit and Reduction Manual, the Ontario Waste Management Corporation says a good waste audit should:

- define sources, quantities, and types of waste generated;
- assemble information on unit processes, products, raw materials, water usage and waste generation;
- highlight process efficiencies and inefficiencies;
- identify areas of waste and loss;
- help to set waste reduction targets;
- help to develop cost-effective waste management strategies;
- increase employee knowledge of production processes and concern for waste reduction.

The Ontario government could also develop procurement policies which promote goods favouring the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. This would help to minimize its waste, establish a larger market for recyclable goods, and serve as an example for other organizations or companies. To be most effective, the procurement policies should be comprehensive and enacted in legislation. They should also apply to all provincial ministries, agencies, boards and crown corporations.

The Ontario government has begun to move in this direction. When the Ontario Environment Minister Jim Bradley announced the Ontario government's waste reduction targets, he said the provincial government would reduce its waste by 25 per cent by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000. It would develop purchasing policies to support markets for recycled products, restrict non-recyclable/non-reusable goods within government, and maximize recycling or recovery of materials such as office paper and cafeteria wastes.

The Ontario government has started to develop its waste management program. Operated by the Ministry of Government Services, it is aimed at reducing its solid waste throughout government by using the 3Rs of recycling, reduction and re-use. Since much of the government's waste is fine paper, the program has started with a recycling component aimed at fine paper, newspaper, corrugated cardboard, bottles and cans. Phase two of the program is expected to address ways to reduce wastes and develop mandatory procurement policies favouring materials with recycled content. The program is also looking at such reuse and reduction programs as refilling laser printer cartridges and placing government forms on computer disc rather than printer paper.

At the time of this report, the Ontario government had initiated its recycling program in all of its government-owned office buildings in Toronto and about one-third of its leased buildings in Toronto. By the end of May, it hoped to have its recycling program in all of its Toronto buildings.

AMO urges the Ontario government to implement all its procurement policies as soon as possible and extend both them and its recycling programs to all of its offices throughout the province. Once these parts of the program are in place, AMO hopes the province's waste management program will be extended to ensure the "3Rs" of reduction, reuse and recycling are applied to all areas of government solid waste for all parts of the province.

RECOMMENDATION #16:

The Ontario government should:

a) develop and implement material use and procurement policies which reflect the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy;

b) immediately extend its material use and procurement policies and recycling programs to all the buildings it occupies, as well as all provincial ministries, agencies, boards and crown corporations;

c) consider co-tendering with municipalities for projects which would assist public agencies in meeting waste reduction targets.

II. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPACT MUNICIPALITIES:

1. Communication:

Ontario's Minister of the Environment and his staff have made several announcements in recent months regarding issues and activities which impact on the municipal solid waste stream. These include the introduction of the province's waste reduction targets, introduction of the first and second Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Incorporation (OMMRI), and funding increases to municipalities.

In most cases, the Association of Municipalities (AMO) and its member municipalities have either learned of these through the media or from press releases. AMO believes municipal solid waste management is a very critical area and communication regarding it should be improved between the provincial and municipal governments.

To correct this, the Ontario government should recognize that policy-making by press release is not acceptable. Policy governing waste management should be developed through consultation and with discussion papers. As the representative of Ontario's municipalities, which have traditionally handled solid waste management, AMO should be involved in developing these policies. Once developed, the policies should be formalized in policy statements, legislation and regulation, and not just in press releases.

RECOMMENDATION #17:

> The Minister of the Environment should recognize that policy-making by press release is not acceptable. Policy should be developed through consultation and with discussion papers and should result in policy statements before the legislation is announced. Regulations should promptly follow the legislation.

AMO and the Ontario government have already begun to try to improve communication between Ontario's municipalities and the provincial government. During 1989, AMO and the Ministry of the Environment established a liaison committee to address solid waste management concerns. This committee is still striving to achieve its goal of quarterly meetings. The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) has also told AMO it will produce two issues of a waste management newsletter to help municipalities become better informed on provincial solid waste management activities. Once two issues have been released, municipalities may comment on the format and decide whether the newsletter is providing them with enough information.

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment could further improve communication with municipalities working with solid waste management issues by hiring an information co-ordinator. This person would be employed by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and work in AMO's office. Similar to AMO's energy co-ordinator, who has been employed by Ontario's Ministry of Energy and works in AMO's offices, the information co-ordinator could serve several functions:

a) disseminate government information on solid waste management to municipalities;

b) co-ordinate an information flow on solid waste management activities and concerns between municipalities;

c) be a central contact for gathering and disseminating information on municipal solid waste from and to organizations seeking this.

RECOMMENDATION #18:

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment should fund the hiring of a municipal solid waste management information co-ordinator, with that person working in AMO's offices. The information co-ordinator would improve communication in this area among municipalities, and between municipalities and the provincial government.

2. Master Plans:

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment has a Waste Management Master Plan Program which provides funds to regional or county municipalities, or groups of municipalities, to encourage them to prepare 20-year waste management master plans. Master plans look at all of an area's waste management alternatives. The funding program pays half the cost of hiring consultants to conduct a study to help prepare that master plan.

The study is coordinated by a steering committee, made up of municipal representatives from the study area and Ministry of the Environment representatives. The study has five stages: data collection, identification of candidate areas and markets, analysis of alternatives, master plan formulation, and writing a master plan environmental assessment overview document. Each study stage is analyzed to ensure it meets the Environmental Assessment Act's requirements and includes processes by which the public may participate and relevant ministries and agencies may provide input.

When the study is done, the master plan may be submitted for Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) approval. This can be done for the master plan itself or by using the plan as a background document for approval of individual facilities recommended in the plan.

Municipalities have a number of concerns and problems with this master plan process. AMO issued a report, The Waste Management Planning and Approvals Process, in March 1989. It addressed these concerns, and since then little has changed. The Ministry of the Environment has recently agreed to form a committee with members of AMO and Ministry staff to implement the recommendations outlined in that report. AMO hopes this committee will resolve these outstanding issues.

3. The Environmental Assessment Act:

The Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) came into effect in 1976. Since then, it has required that all major undertakings done in Ontario must be assessed for their environmental consequences at the earliest stage. Since June 1980, municipalities wishing to establish a new waste management undertaking which could impact the environment, such as a landfill, have been required to do an environmental assessment of the project to meet EAA requirements. That assessment involves identifying reasonable alternatives, considering the environmental effects of each, then selecting a preferred alternative.

Municipalities working through this process have expressed several concerns. Key has been the fact the process is very long, difficult and expensive and, after spending considerable time and money, municipalities often have their selections rejected. This has happened to North Simcoe, the Regional Municipality of Halton in the choice of its preferred site, and the Regional Municipality of Peel, which was stopped by a Minister's Order before it got to an EAA. Municipalities' concerns and recommendations to address these were presented in AMO's report, The Waste Management Planning and Approvals Process, published in March 1989.

The Ontario government has recognized concerns in this area and developed the Environmental Assessment Program Improvement Project (EAPIP). EAPIP's mandate was to streamline the Environmental Assessment process so projects could move through it more quickly. The Ministry of the Environment established the Environmental Assessment Task Force to examine the legislation and program. The Task Force recently issued a draft document outlining a proposed streamlining process for environmental assessment. AMO has been monitoring the process, but an initial response to the draft document by those in municipal waste management indicates that EAPIP's proposals will not solve many of the problems they have outlined in this field. An advisory group of public and private interests, including

AMO as the municipalities' representative, has also been involved in assessing the Environmental Assessment Act.

Staff members of the Ministry of the Environment's Environmental Assessment Branch have been discussing how to address these concerns. They hired a consultant to develop a waste alternative report to provide municipalities with a generic evaluation of the feasible waste management alternatives for Ontario. This would aid municipalities in the initial phase of their assessments.

In November 1989, the Minister of the Environment approved a policy on Environmental Assessment Act exemptions for interim expansion of municipal landfills. This allows municipalities to obtain short-term continuation or expansion of existing landfill sites to meet their needs while their permanent landfill sites are being developed or approved under the Environmental Assessment Act. It allows for a five-year exemption to get municipalities through crises. This is not enough time for some Ontario municipalities.

Although many municipalities' concerns regarding the Environmental Assessment Act are being discussed, little has changed since AMO's Waste Management Planning and Approvals Process report was released in March 1989. On March 27, 1990, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment asked AMO to join it in forming a committee to address municipalities' EAA concerns as raised in AMO's March 1989 report. The ministry said the committee would also implement the report's recommendations. AMO is still awaiting action on that.

III. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPACT INDUSTRY:

1. Waste Composition Study:

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment also commissioned a province-wide waste composition study to define what is in Ontario's solid waste stream. That study is expected to be released later this year. Once it is, AMO hopes the Ontario government will identify which industries produce the most materials going into landfills. Industries so identified should then be required by the Ontario government to develop a "4Rs" policy, based on the waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, to reduce their solid waste streams in accordance with the province's waste reduction goals. All industries should eventually be addressed in this way, with the highest priority being given to those which produce the most

waste and the waste it is most difficult to dispose of. Voluntary compliance could be used first, but if that does not work, the province should develop and enforce regulations.

RECOMMENDATION #19:

The Ministry of the Environment should immediately release its province-wide waste composition study. Then it should:

a) identify which industries produce the most materials entering landfills;

b) require these industries to develop a "4Rs" policy, based on the waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling, and recovery, to reduce solid waste in accordance with Ontario's waste reduction goals;

c) make compliance voluntary but develop and enforce regulations if that does not work.

2. National Packaging Protocol:

As a member of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME), the Ontario Minister of the Environment has agreed to the CCME's National Packaging Protocol. These guidelines are aimed at reducing Canada's packaging waste by half of its 1988 levels by the end of the year 2000.

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) has been looking at ways to achieve that goal by:

a) considering how to measure the amount of packaging waste generated;

b) looking at establishing a multi-stakeholder group to advise on how the National Packaging Protocol could be implemented;

c) developing a monitoring and reporting system to ensure packaging waste is being reduced;

d) planning to develop regulations so industry knows what penalties it faces if it does not voluntarily comply with the protocol.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario congratulates the Ontario government for its steps in this direction. However, if it forms a multi-stakeholder advisory group, it should include a municipal government representative. AMO also wishes to emphasize that regulations are needed so that if industries fail to voluntarily comply with the protocol, there will be recourse to ensure that they reduce packaging.

The Ontario government should also urge the federal government to use the model through which it developed the National Packaging Protocol to address the reduction of other components of Canada's solid waste stream.

RECOMMENDATION #20:

In developing the Ontario share of the National Packaging Protocol strategy, the Ontario government should:

a) include a municipal government representative on its multi-stakeholder advisory group;

b) introduce regulations to ensure the National Packaging Protocol's targets for reducing packaging waste are met.

The Ontario government should also urge the federal government to use the National Packaging Protocol model to reduce other components of Canada's solid waste stream.

3. Ontario's Blue Box Recycling Program:

In 1985, the Ontario government passed legislation to exempt metal, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) plastic and non-refillable glass soft drink containers from mandatory deposits. It stated that industry must contribute to establishing and promoting a recycling program which would ensure a minimum of 50 per cent of these containers were recycled in municipal multi-material recycling projects by November 1988.

The result was that the soft drink industry and its container suppliers formed the Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI) in 1986. It was to operate until 1990 and establish, provide start-up funds for, and promote municipal recycling programs. Working through OMMRI, these industries provided $20 million to pay one-third of the capital costs for the municipalities' Blue Box recycling programs, a decreasing level of operating cost support for the first five years of these programs, and one-third of the cost of providing one household recycling bin (Blue Box) per household. The Ontario government paid another third of those costs, and municipalities participating in these programs paid the final third. However, municipalities - which had no input in the establishment of OMMRI - have been left to pay all of the recycling program's long-term operating costs. By the end of OMMRI, the Blue Box recycling program had been spread to about 1.8 million households in more than 300 Ontario communities.

AMO has congratulated the Ontario government for the fact its Blue Box program has helped to educate the public about, and involve it in helping to solve, the growing municipal solid waste stream. It has also commended it for including industry for the first time in a recognized role to help reduce the solid waste stream which it helped create.

But AMO also has two concerns. One is that the Blue Box program diverts energy, resources and attention from the focus of reducing and reusing products so there is not as much waste. A good provincial waste management strategy should decrease the amount of garbage being generated rather than leave that amount static and just recycle the waste. The second concern is that the Blue Box program is very expensive for Ontario municipalities to implement. Many Ontario municipalities have implemented the program and found it has cost them from $120 to more than $200 per tonne to carry it out.

AMO has criticized the Ontario government for several aspects of its Blue Box recycling program. These include criticisms that the Ontario government has:

- focused solely on recycling at the expense of the other "Rs" of reduction, reuse and recovery;
- not included the municipal sector in the decisions taken to form OMMRI;
- not provided long-term funding for this recycling program;
- not provided support for markets to ensure the materials collected in the recycling program can be re-used.

Despite these concerns, and the fact recycling is only reducing a small amount of municipal solid waste being landfilled, the Ontario government negotiated a second OMMRI phase with Ontario industry. Announced in February 1990, it included industries representing more than 1700 businesses across Ontario. These agreed to spend $45 million over five years to spread the Blue Box recycling program to a total of 3 million Ontario households by 1995. OMMRI II agreed to:

- extend the Blue Box recycling program to new communities and high-rise apartments;
- expand existing and new recycling programs by including more plastics, corrugated cardboard, boxboard, mixed papers and other materials;
- fund market development for recycled products and help to develop recycling research and technology;
- upgrade and expand facilities to handle and process recyclable materials;
- encourage commercial and institutional recycling;
- demonstrate and initiate home and community organic waste composting.

While agreeing to provide funds to meet these goals, OMMRI II's industry members also agreed to:

- review their purchasing practices to encourage the use of products containing recycled materials;
- review product and package designs to minimize material weight and volume;
- promote internal recycling initiatives.

The Ministry of the Environment promised it would:

- contribute $50 million over ten years to municipalities to help them set up central municipal composting units and aid householders in setting up home composting units;
- expect key sectors--such as office towers (fine paper), construction companies (gypsum wallboard waste), commercial plazas (corrugated cardboard), food wholesalers and retailers (corrugated cardboard and organic waste), and fast food outlets (packaging and organic wastes)--to develop "4Rs" programs with provincial aid.

While the new elements introduced in OMMRI II alleviate some concerns AMO has expressed about the first OMMRI, it does not eliminate them. The Ontario government has extended more of its waste reduction program into industry, stated it will address more of the solid waste stream, and provided some support for composting, but it has not yet introduced a well-rounded waste reduction strategy. Its focus and funding are still primarily on recycling, and the efforts it has made its OMMRI II members promise to undertake also focus on recycling. However, municipalities were no more involved in establishing OMMRI II than they were in establishing OMMRI I.) The provincial government and industry have also made no further commitment to providing long-term funding for municipal recycling programs, and there has been little additional support to provide markets for recyclable materials. AMO urges the Ontario government to address these concerns.

RECOMMENDATION #21:

To strengthen its OMMRI II program, the Ontario government should:

a) encourage industry to adopt the "4R" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery to divert its solid waste;

b) include municipalities in discussions regarding industry-provincial municipal waste minimization strategies which impact them or the solid waste stream they manage;

c) continue to assist with the development of markets for recyclable materials;

d) ensure the Ontario government and industry provide long-term funding for the Blue Box recycling programs which they initiated. This funding should continue to be one-third of the total cost for each partner, and should be available for as long as revenue from selling recyclables fails to cover the costs of recycling programs.

4. Soft Drink Container Legislation:

The Ontario government passed legislation in 1985 to exempt metal, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) plastic and non-refillable glass soft drink containers from the mandatory deposit system. At the time, the understanding was these exemptions were being granted to industry because it agreed to contribute to the establishment and promotion of a recycling program. This program was to ensure a minimum of

50 per cent of soft drink containers were recycled in municipal multi-material recycling projects by November 1988. Industry was also to provide a prescribed percentage of refillable soft drink containers.

Since then, several soft drink bottlers have been fined for failing to provide enough soft drinks in refillable containers. They have argued they cannot meet those requirements because people prefer to buy soft drinks in cans rather than refillable containers. Pressure has mounted on the Ontario government to once again amend the legislation. In mid-April 1990, the Ministry of the Environment responded by stating it plans to revise downward again the percentage of refillable containers it requires soft drink companies to use.

AMO strongly opposes that action. It urges the Ontario government not to eliminate the provincial requirement for soft drink producers to provide at least 30 per cent of their products in refillable containers. It also urges the provincial government to continue to encourage reuse as an important component of waste management.

RECOMMENDATION #22:

The Ontario government should:

a) reject the Recycling Advisory Council's recommendation to eliminate the provincial requirement for soft drink producers to provide at least 30 per cent of their products in refillable containers;

b) continue to encourage reuse as an important component of waste management.

c) encourage people to become aware that recyclable bottles are better for reuse.

Ontario's movement away from refillable containers is contrary to what other provincial governments are doing. British Columbia is considering the establishment of a bottle deposit system. Saskatchewan already has one. The Alberta Beverage Container Act was implemented in 1972 and under its beverage container recovery system, industry must provide a refund system for soft drinks, mineral water, liquor, non-alcoholic beer, wine and some tea. The system does not cover boxed beverages, distilled water, milk, or domestic beer, the latter of which is collected through the Alberta Brewers' deposit system.

Under the Alberta deposit system, users pay a deposit of five cents for a one-litre or less refillable or non-refillable beverage container and 20 cents for a refillable or non-refillable beverage container which is more than one litre. The deposit is refunded when the containers are returned to one of Alberta's 200 depots. The originating company collects the containers from the depots and pays the depot operators a handling fee. Alberta government officials note the system has an 80 to 85 per cent return rate. The Alberta government's major concern now is industry keeps the deposits on non-returned containers and it is looking at ways to have that money returned to the consumer.

The Ontario government should strengthen, rather than loosen, the regulations which require soft drink containers to be refillable. They should also be extended to cover all types of beverage containers, including wine, liquor, and juice containers. If this was done the reuse component of the "4Rs" hierarchy would be strengthened. Energy and materials used if these containers had to be recycled would also be saved.

RECOMMENDATION #23:

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment should:

a) strengthen the regulations requiring soft drink containers to be refillable. It should also extend these to cover all beverage containers;

b) ensure a deposit system is instituted for all beverage containers.

IV. PROVINCIAL FUNDING:

The Ministry of the Environment has a series of programs which provide funding to municipalities involved in solid waste management. (See Appendix B for details.) They range over the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, but most of the funds are allocated to the recycling component.

1. **The Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP)** provides funds to help municipalities, or groups of municipalities, develop their long-term (20-year) waste management plans. Master plans look at all of an area's waste management alternatives. The program had a 1989/90 budget of $2 million. Each grant is for up to 50 per cent of the cost of developing the plan and there is presently no maximum limit.

2. **The Financial Assistance Program (FAP)** provides municipalities with funds to establish or expand landfills, transfer stations and processing facilities for waste disposal. The program had a 1989/90 budget of $8 million. Project funding ranges from 50 per cent to 75 per cent, with more money given to smaller municipalities.

3. **The Waste Management Improvement Program (WMIP)** had a 1989/90 budget of $3.15 million. It provides funds for "needy" municipalities in need to upgrade existing sites, close sites, do investigative studies and provide remedial measures at active sites. From 50 per cent to 75 per cent of a project's cost will be funded, with small municipalities getting the largest percentage.

4. **The Municipal Recycling Support Program (MRSP)** provides funds to help municipalities start and operate recycling programs. The program has seven grant types which are available to both municipalities and the private sector. The program's total 1989/90 budget was $6.405 million for capital and $5 million for operation funds.

    a) Operating Cost Grant: Provides a decreasing level of operating cost support over a five-year period to help municipalities and other recyclers operate recycling programs. The grant is for up to 50 per cent of operating costs in year one, 40 per cent in year two, 30 per cent in year three, 20 per cent in year four, 10 per cent in year five, and no funding after that.

    b) Capital Cost Grant: Provides up to five years of support for a recycling project's plant and equipment costs as well as recycling vehicles. The grant pays one-third of the approved costs of a project's building and equipment capital costs. The Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI) pays one-third of equipment costs and the municipality pays the rest.

c) **Household Recycling Bins**: The program pays part of the costs for household recycling bins, better known as Blue Boxes. The grant will pay up to one-third of the cost of one bin per household. OMMRI pays one-third of the cost.

d) **Promotion/Advertising Grant**: Provides funds to promote and advertise local recycling projects. The grant pays up to 50 per cent of the cost of designing, producing, and distributing promotion and advertising material. Maximum limit is 10 cents per capita per year for up to five years.

e) **Education Grant**: Provides funds to support educational projects which raise the awareness and understanding of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. The grant is for up to $15,000.

f) **Demonstration Grant**: Encourages new, more efficient waste collection and handling methods and the development of new market approaches. The grant pay up to 100 per cent of the cost of demonstration projects, studies and pilot projects which advance recycling technology.

g) **Feasibility Study Grant**: Provides funds to pay the cost of hiring a consultant when feasibility studies are needed for Operating and Capital Cost grant applications. It pays up to 50 per cent of eligible study costs.

5. **The Student Action for Recycling (STAR)** grant supports school boards wishing to promote recycling and to increase student awareness of, and involvement in, waste management. Money for this program is allocated in the MRSP budget (see #4). Municipalities may receive up to 100 per cent of the cost of a collection vehicle(s) just to serve the school board.

6. **The Municipal Recovery Program (MRP)** encourages municipalities to recover useful materials not already taken from the waste stream by consumer recycling and prevent these from being disposed of in landfill sites. Compostable waste, glass, plastic, aluminum, steel, paper and other mixed waste can be recovered. The program had a 1989/90 budget if $600,000. It funds two areas:

a) **Demonstration Grant**: Municipalities may receive up to 100 per cent of the cost of demonstrating a project.

b) **Capital Grant**: Municipalities may receive up to one-third of the capital cost of developing and starting a facility.

7. **The Municipal Reduction/Reuse Program (MRRP)** provides municipalities and others with funds to implement projects which encourage consumer awareness of reusing and reducing waste so it does not need treatment and disposal. This includes

home composting, packaging and new product approaches. The MRRP budget for 1989/90 was $130,000. Applicants may receive up to 50 per cent of promotion and advertising costs and up to 50 per cent of capital costs incurred by municipalities. Development of creative projects or materials, such as educational pamphlets, may be funded up to 100 per cent, with a limit of $25,000 per project.

8. **The Household Hazardous Waste Program (HHWP)** provides funds for disposal of hazardous household waste through day or weekend household hazardous waste collection projects. These encourage householders to bring household hazardous wastes to a specific location so they will not enter the landfill and sewage systems. The HHWP budget was recently increased from $250,000 to $1 million. The program will pay 50 per cent of the operating costs, up to a maximum of $5,000, for up to two special waste days or weekends held in one year. Applicants who recycle paint and oil are eligible for an additional grant of up to $10,000.

While these programs have been available for some years, the Ministry of the Environment also introduced a new funding program on March 14, 1990.

9. **The Environmental Technologies Program (ETP)** stimulates development of new products and processes which protect the environment. ETP provides up to 50 per cent of a project's funding. Funding is available for up to a maximum of $500,000 per year for a maximum of three years.
The Ontario Ministry of the Environment has offered the first eight funding programs for some years. AMO has criticized these for:

- allocating most of the funds to programs which promote recycling;
- allocating less than 10 per cent of the funds to programs promoting reduction and reuse;
- not funding programs in accordance with the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order.

On February 19, 1990, Environment Minister Jim Bradley announced funding for recycling programs would nearly double during the next year. Money available for municipal, institutional and industrial recycling projects would increase to $38.5 million in 1990/91 from $20.3 million in 1989/90.

Of this, provincial funding to Ontario municipalities would climb to $25.1 million from $13.7 million. That money is for expanding the Blue Box curbside recycling program and introducing apartment recycling and rural depots. About $4 million of the municipalities' share is to aid establishment of home and communal composting projects.

Another $2 million is for developing markets for recycled goods. This money is available for researching product viability and as start-up incentives for new recycling operations.

Provincial support for industrial waste reduction, re-use and recycling projects will increase to $8.2 million.

Despite this increased financial assistance, there will only be a slight increase in funding for Ontario municipalities' reduction and reuse programs. Most of the Ministry of the Environment's funding is still allocated to recycling projects. AMO's earlier recommendation that the Ontario government should provide funding which reflects a "4Rs" waste management hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order, still stands.

RECOMMENDATION #24:

The Ontario government should provide funding which reflects a "4Rs" waste management hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order.

The Ministry of the Environment also announced on February 16, 1990 that it is developing a discussion paper to examine options for future financing of municipal solid waste management systems. The paper is to be released in the spring of 1990 and reviewed by governments, industry and the public.

AMO offers several recommendations to improve the Ministry of the Environment's funding programs for municipalities. These include:

a) eliminating the words "up to" in the grant programs since this phrase leads municipalities to believe they will receive some money when they do not;

b) informing municipalities how much money is in a particular fund, and when that money has expired so municipalities will not continue to apply for it;

c) instituting an announced time limit in which to reply to municipalities regarding funding programs so municipalities know whether funding is forthcoming or not;

d) increasing the amount of funding going into the total package to service more municipalities needing this aid.

RECOMMENDATION #25:

The Ministry of the Environment should improve its funding programs by:

a) eliminating the words "up to" in the grant programs;

b) telling municipalities how much money is in a particular fund, and when that money has been depleted;

c) instituting an announced time limit in which to reply to municipalities;

d) increasing the amount of funding going into the total package.

V. ENERGY-FROM-WASTE:

The Ontario government has two conflicting positions regarding the recovery process of energy-from-waste. Energy-from-waste is a process of burning non-toxic waste to create heat or electricity.

On the one hand, the Ministry of Energy has a funding program to encourage energy-from-waste. The Capital Assistance Program began in 1987 and had $25 million to allocate over five years to provide capital funds to encourage energy-from-waste projects. The program provides municipalities with funds for capital costs, providing the municipality has an Environmental Assessment approval before applying for a grant. The grant is for 15 per cent of the project's capital costs, up to a maximum of $6 million.

The Environmental Assessment Act also requires municipalities to consider energy-from-waste in its examination of all waste management alternatives.

On the other hand, Ontario Environment Minister Jim Bradley has said that waste reduced through energy-from-waste projects cannot be calculated in municipalities' efforts to meet his goal of reducing municipal solid waste by 25 per cent by 1992 and 50 per cent by the year 2000.

Municipalities are confused by this mixed message and would like the province to clarify its energy-from-waste stand. It wants the Ontario government to clarify how it plans to measure the progress toward its diversion targets and whether the progress is to be measured for the entire province or for each municipality. AMO wants the province to also state what part incineration should play in measuring municipalities' progress toward the Ontario government's waste reduction targets.

AMO also wants the Ontario government to extend the Capital Assistance Program beyond 1992. Most municipalities will not be able to apply for the fund by then as they will not yet have Environmental Assessment approval for such projects.

RECOMMENDATION #26

The Ontario government should:

a) clarify its stand on energy-from-waste so municipalities know whether it is, or is not, an acceptable waste management practice;

b) extend the energy-from-waste Capital Assistance Program's funding beyond 1992.

PART III

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

ROLES:

Municipalities have traditionally managed and financed the collection and disposal of municipal solid waste. Now, managing municipal solid waste requires a much larger system. More Ontario municipalities are becoming responsible for systems which include waste collection, disposal, recycling, reuse, composting, recovery and management of household hazardous waste.

Under the Municipal Act, Ontario municipalities have the permissive authority to collect and dispose of municipal solid waste, or oversee the contracting out of this work. They may also acquire land for waste disposal and levy charges. The Municipal Act does not give municipalities specific statutory authority to deal with the "4Rs" of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of solid waste.

Bill 201, now part of the Municipal Act, gives counties permissive authority to handle solid waste management. Counties can assume authority for waste collection and disposal by passing a bylaw to which two-thirds of the county council's members must agree.

Regional municipalities are governed by the legislation which established them and their legal authority for their area's solid waste management is indicated in that legislation. Generally, they have a mandatory responsibility under that legislation to handle waste disposal. This is true for all Ontario regional municipalities except Muskoka and Niagara. In regional municipalities, waste collection is generally done by local municipalities.

The power for municipalities to implement recycling, reduction, reuse and recovery activities for municipal solid waste is not specifically addressed in The Municipal Act. The Ontario government believes municipalities may do these. Solicitors for Ontario's municipalities say they must receive statutory authority over these areas before they can proceed.

Some regional and local municipalities have been asking the Ontario government to clarify their powers in this area. In 1986, the Ontario government revised the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Bill to clarify that municipality's role in municipal solid waste management and empower it to recycle. Since then, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs has been reviewing other regional municipalities' legislation to ensure they also can assume the diverse solid waste management roles now being asked of them.

The Ontario government and AMO have discussed forming a committee which could clarify municipalities' statutory authority for reduction, reuse and recycling. AMO has specifically asked the government to look at:

- recycling;
- power to direct waste;
- power to mandate source separation of commercial/industrial waste;
- power to require waste audits and right to inspect pursuant to waste by-laws;
- power to recover waste;
- inter-municipal acquisition of land for waste management purposes;
- power to enter private property without owners' consent pursuant to waste planning studies;
- power to impose user pay-fees.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Delineating Responsibilities:

AMO has been urging the provincial government to better define all municipalities' statutory authority for reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. This includes reviewing and changing the legislation governing counties, regional municipalities and local municipalities. To that end, AMO urges the Ontario government to make several changes to the various municipalities' governing legislation.

First, the province should review all municipal legislation for regional municipalities, counties, and local municipalities where counties have not opted to take responsibility for waste management. This would apply to the areas covered by Bill 201. The review and resulting legislative amendments would ensure each municipality has enough waste management authority to reduce, reuse, recycle and recover waste. The resulting amendments should allow municipalities to delegate final facility-siting decisions to county or regional municipalities with no appeal process for an area municipality.

Second, The Municipal Act should be amended to apply to areas where Bill 201 is not applicable. This means amending the act to give municipalities which are contemplating waste management master plans the authority to include land acquisition for waste management purposes in inter-municipal agreements. These municipalities should also be given the authority to agree to forego their right to approve any land acquisition within their boundaries for waste disposal purposes when they opt into this plan. That way, if one municipality is chosen to be the host municipality for a waste management site, that municipality cannot object to the site allocation if it subsequently chooses to opt out of the waste management master planning unit.

Third, the province should create legislation with an efficient and fair procedure to allow proponents to enter and use private property for waste management planning studies. Municipal authority provided by this amendment could be used where property owners refuse consent to those wishing to enter their premises for these studies.

RECOMMENDATION #27

The Ontario government should:

a) review all municipal legislation for regional municipalities, counties and local municipalities where counties have not opted to take responsibility for waste management. The review and resulting legislative amendments would ensure that each municipality has sufficient waste management authority for reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of waste projects. The resulting amendments should also result in municipalities being able to delegate final facility siting decisions to county or regional municipalities with no appeal process for an area municipality;

b) amend The Municipal Act (section 208, paragraph 5) to explicitly give municipalities contemplating the waste management master plan, where Bill 201 is not applicable, the authority to include land acquisition for waste management purposes in inter-municipal agreements and the authority to agree to forego their right (under The Municipal Act, Section 210, paragraph 84) to approve any land acquisition within their boundaries for waste disposal purposes if they subsequently chose to opt out of the waste management master planning unit;

c) create legislation with an efficient and fair procedure to allow proponents to enter and use private property for waste management planning studies. Municipal authority provided by this amendment could be used where property owners refuse consent to those wishing to enter their premises for these studies.

Besides having the provincial government review and amend its legislation governing municipalities to better define their statutory authority over the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy", AMO urges municipalities to review their legislative authority in this area. Some regional and county municipalities have been examining how they would have their legislation amended to allow them to carry out reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of solid waste. But more municipalities should undertake such a review of their legislation and ask the province to amend their governing legislation to ensure they have the power to implement the diverse range of new waste management responsibilities now being asked of them.

RECOMMENDATION #28:

Municipalities should review their governing legislation and ask the province to make the necessary legislative changes to allow them the authority to implement the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

2. Developing an Integrated Solid Waste Management Program:

Many municipalities have begun to develop an integrated solid waste management program. The City of Kitchener established a pilot Blue Box program in 1981 and extended that to the rest of its city in 1983. Many other municipalities now are operating recycling programs.

The City of Guelph earlier this year began work on developing and operating a pilot-scale wet/dry recycling system. A wet-dry recycling system allows individuals to separate their kitchen, garden or other food wastes into a wet stream, and their other garbage into a dry stream. The wet stream is then taken to a central composting plant for processing. The dry waste stream is processed in a central recycling plant.

Many other municipalities are working on waste management plans which incorporate many of the "Rs" from the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. This includes recycling and composting programs, and energy-from-waste facilities. These are all being introduced to augment the service these municipalities already offer through their collection and disposal in landfills.

However, not all municipalities are doing this. AMO encourages them to start implementing an integrated solid waste management system. If Canadians are to make the best use of their resources, protect their environment, reduce the amount of solid waste they produce and extend the life of their landfills, all municipalities need to be moving toward an integrated solid waste management plan.

RECOMMENDATION #29:

All Ontario municipalities should introduce an integrated solid waste management plan which incorporates the "4Rs" of the waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery as well as the more traditional activities of collection and disposal.

3. Waste Audits:

As with all other government levels and businesses, municipal governments could help to reduce the growth of the solid waste stream by reducing their own waste generation. They could conduct waste audits aimed at identifying, reducing and eliminating much of their own waste. This would reduce waste generation and serve as an example for local industries and businesses.

As noted in previous sections of this report, the Ontario Waste Management Corporation has stated that a good waste audit should:

- define sources, quantities, and types of waste generated;
- assemble information on unit processes, products, raw materials, water usage and waste generation;
- highlight process efficiencies and inefficiencies;
- identify areas of waste and loss;
- help to set waste reduction targets;
- help to develop cost-effective waste management strategies;
- increase employee knowledge of production processes and concern for waste reduction.

RECOMMENDATION #30:

Every Ontario municipal government should conduct a waste audit to reduce its own solid waste generation.

4. Procurement Policies:

With both the federal and provincial governments beginning to implement procurement policies, each Ontario municipal government should do the same. Procurement policies can help to promote markets for goods resulting from one of the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. They can also set an example for other local businesses and industries and help municipalities reduce their solid waste generation. Procurement policies serving this purpose include purchasing of recycled paper and goods with reduced packaging. To be most effective, the policies should be comprehensive and enshrined in department policies.

RECOMMENDATION #31:

All Ontario municipal governments should introduce comprehensive procurement policies which promote the use of products favouring the first 3Rs of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

5. Material Bans at Landfills:

Many municipalities are finding that the waste which commercial haulers dump at municipal landfills includes much recyclable material. This includes such items as wood and corrugated cardboard.

To prevent these useful materials from going to landfills, all Ontario municipal governments should impose a landfill ban on such items where alternative markets for these goods are available. Prior to banning certain commercial materials at municipal landfill sites, municipalities should first give commercial waste haulers sufficient notice that the ban is going to be implemented. Municipalities, with the provincial government's assistance, should then work with these haulers and their customers, the waste producers, to find "4Rs" alternatives for their materials.

RECOMMENDATION #32:

a) Municipalities, with the provincial government's assistance, should help commercial waste haulers and their customers, the waste producers, find "4Rs" alternatives for their materials.

b) Prior to banning certain commercial materials at municipal landfill sites, municipalities should give commercial waste haulers sufficient notice that the ban is going to be implemented.

c) All Ontario municipalities should ban the dumping of recyclable materials in their landfills where appropriate markets for these goods are available.

6. Private Landfills:

Many Ontario municipalities have imposed dumping bans and diversion initiatives at their landfills and raised their tipping fees only to find haulers take their waste to a nearby private landfill where there may be no such bans.

To prevent this undermining of the municipal governments' efforts to better manage the municipal solid waste stream, Ontario municipalities would like the Ontario government to give them authority to approve the establishment and continued use of private waste disposal systems in their jurisdictions. This would allow them to maintain the financial viability of public waste management programs. Municipalities could do this by ensuring that dumping bans and diversion initiatives are universally enforced in the landfills in their jurisdiction.

RECOMMENDATION #33:

Ontario municipalities should be given authority to approve the establishment and continued use of private waste disposal systems in their jurisdiction in order to better manage the solid waste stream.

7. Inter-municipal Solid Waste Management:

Many of the new components of an integrated solid waste management system are very complex and expensive to operate. Instituting a system which provides collection, disposal, recycling, reduction, composting, an energy-from-waste facility and landfilling may be beyond the capability of many small municipalities. It may also be a strain for some larger municipalities.

Some municipalities are already providing many of these. In some regional municipalities, the local municipality collects the waste and the regional government disposes of it. However, more Ontario municipalities could benefit from investigating a co-operative model. This might result in a co-operative venture, such as a board of management, which could help the municipalities to work together to institute an integrated waste management plan for their area.

Municipalities in the Niagara Region have already begun to work together in this fashion through a "club" system. The Niagara Region Waste Management Master Plan was approved in 1989 by all of the region's area municipalities. The municipalities agreed the most appropriate way to manage their solid waste on a long-term basis was to form area clubs. These clubs were to examine all of the waste management alternatives for waste disposal and oversee the introduction of the "4Rs" of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery in their areas. Beyond that, it was expected they could manage household hazardous waste days for their areas.

At the time, it was recommended that three clubs be formed. Since then, two of the clubs have formed and the municipalities in the third area have formed two mini-clubs. The Grimsby club, which consists of Grimsby, Pelham, Lincoln and West Lincoln, has been operating for about three years and has formed a board of management with representatives from its four municipalities, the Ministry of the Environment and a public advisory committee. In the spring of 1990, it was conducting a study to find a new landfill site. The St. Catharines club, consisting of St. Catharines, Thorold, Niagara-on-the-Lake and Niagara Falls, was establishing its implementation strategy and supporting agreement in mid-1990. The third club was to consist of Fort Erie, Port Colborne, Welland and Wainfleet. But, in mid-1990, Fort Erie and Port Colborne had formed one mini-club and Wainfleet and Welland had formed a second. They, too, were working on the management of their areas' solid waste with a view to becoming a larger club at a later date.

AMO urges municipalities to investigate such co-operate ventures as these joint boards of management to implement integrated waste management programs for their areas.

RECOMMENDATION #34:

Municipalities should investigate co-operative ventures, such as joint boards of management, to implement integrated waste management programs for a particular area.

COSTS:

Municipalities are being faced with both an increased solid waste stream and increased costs for solid waste management. This now includes everything from recycling and reducing waste to planning, approvals, locating sites, closing and long-term maintenance of landfills.

Municipalities should include in their waste audits information which would provide them with a true cost accounting of their solid waste management system. This could then aid municipalities in their calculation of the most cost-efficient methods by which to manage their solid waste.

RECOMMENDATION #35:

Municipalities should include in audits of their waste management systems information which would provide them with a true cost accounting of their solid waste management system.

FUNDING:

The cost of handling the municipal solid waste stream and implementing an integrated solid waste management system is steadily increasing. Because of this, municipalities are looking for ways to both decrease the waste stream and pay for all the solid waste management strategies they now must implement and operate.

Two methods being implemented by more municipalities are tipping fees and user fees.

1. Tipping fees:

During the past few years, many Ontario municipalities have increased their tipping fees. This has been done for two reasons:

a) to discourage disposal of solid waste which could better be reduced, reused or recycled;

b) to better reflect the true cost of waste disposal and cover the cost of the municipalities' growing waste management systems.

Despite this, a recent survey by the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (NRTEE) shows many municipalities' tipping fees are still very low or non-existent. Others, such as the County of Wellington's, have risen to $76 per tonne and that money is used to fund the area's recycling and composting programs. The NRTEE survey shows the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth's tipping fee has risen to $110 per tonne.

In March 1989, Ontario's Minister of the Environment noted he would urge municipalities to increase their tipping fees to reflect the full operating and replacement costs of their waste management facilities. The Minister said money should be put in a reserve fund to make the municipal solid waste management system self-supporting.

RECOMMENDATION #36:

All Ontario municipalities should:

a) set their tipping fees so these reflect the total life-cycle cost of operating their solid waste management systems;

b) dedicate the revenue from tipping fees to fund their integrated waste management system.

2. User fees:

Several Ontario municipalities are beginning to look at the introduction of user-pay fees which would be charged by the amount of garbage picked up at a residence. The fee could be charged by weight, the number of containers, type of waste (no fee for recyclables and a fee for garbage designated for the landfill) or service frequency. The municipalities studying the potential of these fees say imposing user-pay fees would:

a) discourage residential disposal of solid waste which could better be reduced, reused or recycled;

b) reduce the solid waste stream;

c) make it so those generating the waste must pay for its management;

d) remove solid waste costs from the property tax base;

e) generate more revenue.

Those arguing the alternative side say introduction of user-pay fees would create more illegal dumping of waste. Concerns also exist that user-pay fees should not be implemented until there are alternative methods introduced by governments for handling waste. These would include such things as package reduction, composting and recycling.

In March 1989, the Ontario Minister of the Environment also noted municipalities would be urged to implement user-pay charges on all commercial and industrial waste. The purpose of that was to encourage waste generators to reduce waste. Since then, the Recycling Advisory Committee, which advises that minister on recycling issues, has prepared a report on user-pay fees. That report has not yet been released.

PART IV

INDUSTRY

ROLES:

With the introduction of the Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. and the National and Ontario Round Tables on the Environment and the Economy, industry has begun to play a much more active part in the reduction of the municipal solid waste stream. Working with government to reduce packaging waste and committing itself to reducing its own waste through commitments to the Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI) II, various industries have already begun to take steps toward decreasing the amount of waste they contribute to the solid waste stream.

While some industries may have already started to introduce the "4Rs" solid waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery to deal with the solid waste they produce, others have not. It is not the intention of this report to catalogue each industry's activities. Rather, its purpose is to introduce the principle that industry, like governments and the public, is a major contributor to the solid waste stream and industry, like governments and the public, is responsible for decreasing its contribution to that waste stream. Along with that, AMO also believes that while there are many waste generators, the ultimate responsibility for disposing of waste should be borne by those industries and companies which generate it.

ACTIVITIES:

1. The Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI):

In return for having the Ontario government pass legislation to exempt metal, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) plastic and non-refillable glass soft drink containers from mandatory deposits, the soft drink industry and its container suppliers agreed in 1985 to establish the Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI). Contributing $20 million over five years, the OMMRI participants began in 1986 to introduce the municipal multi-material recycling (Blue Box) program throughout Ontario. OMMRI paid one-third of the start-up capital costs for municipal multi-material recycling programs. The provincial government and municipality in which the program was introduced equally shared the other two-thirds of the program's start-up costs. When the first OMMRI ended in 1990, the Blue Box recycling program had spread to about 1.8 million households in more than 300 Ontario communities.

The second phase of OMMRI, OMMRI II, was introduced in February 1990. This time, industries representing 1700 Ontario businesses agreed to spend $45 million over the following five years to expand the Blue Box recycling program to a total of 3 million Ontario households. This program phase is also to include the expansion of the types of items accepted in the Blue Box, limited funding for recycled materials market development, the beginning of commercial and institutional recycling, and some support for home and community organic waste composting.

While the two OMMRI programs have generated both praise and criticism from municipalities, the wedding of industry and government to develop the multi-material recycling program for Ontario residents has for the first time acknowledged industry's responsibility to help decrease and manage the municipal solid waste stream.

2. National Packaging Protocol:

Representatives of the packaging industry, as well as the federal, provincial and municipal governments developed the National Packaging Protocol to decrease Canada's packaging waste by 50 per cent from its 1988 levels by the end of the year 2000. As noted in the federal government section, work on this is still continuing. But AMO recommends that this model be used to address and reduce other parts of the municipal solid waste stream.

3. Advisory Committees:

Industry representatives have become involved in several government advisory committees which are multi-stakeholder groups and which are addressing aspects of the municipal solid waste stream. For example, there is industry representation on the:

- National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (NRTEE), which advises the federal government on matters related to sustainable development;
- Ontario Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (ORTEE), which advises the provincial government on matters related to sustainable development;
- Recycling Advisory Committee, which advises the Ontario Minister of the Environment on recycling-related issues, but which hopes to expand that role to advising him on other waste minimization strategies.

This is not a comprehensive list. But it shows that many industries are interested in reducing the municipal solid waste stream. By showing such commitment, industry recognizes it is a partner in both the creation and management of solid waste.

4. Waste Audits:

If Canada and Ontario are to reach their stated goal of 50 per cent waste reduction by the end of the year 2000, industries, government and the public must reduce the amount of solid waste they produce. Industries can begin to do that by conducting a waste audit of their operations. In its Industrial Waste Audit and Reduction Manual, the Ontario Waste Management Corporation says a good waste audit should:

- define sources, quantities, and types of waste generated;
- assemble information on unit processes, products, raw materials, water usage and waste generation;
- highlight process efficiencies and inefficiencies;
- identify areas of waste and loss;
- help to set waste reduction targets;
- help to develop cost-effective waste management strategies;
- increase employee knowledge of production processes and concern for waste reduction.

RECOMMENDATION # 37:

Industries should conduct waste audits of their operations to reduce the solid waste which they produce.

5. Introduction of the "4Rs":

Once a waste audit has been conducted, industry can take two routes to help reduce the municipal solid waste stream. First, it can introduce the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery throughout its operation.

The industries which have agreed to fund OMMRI II have also agreed to promote internal recycling initiatives. However, the introduction of a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy would go beyond that. In its report, The Next Frontier: Solid Waste Source Reduction, the Gildea Resource Centre of the Community Environmental Council in Santa Barbara, California, suggests several strategies to reduce waste during the production process. These include:

- reformulating the product to eliminate or reduce waste production;
- modernizing the plant to increase product efficiency;
- redesigning industrial processes to minimize pollution and conserve resources;
- substituting low-hazard products for toxic products.

The second route which industries could take to help the public decrease its solid waste generation is a redesign of its products. Industries which have participated in the National Packaging Protocol have already agreed to reduce packaging waste by 50 per cent from the 1988 levels by the end of the year 2000. Ontario industries which have agreed to fund OMMRI II have also agreed to review their product and package designs to minimize the material weight and volume. To go further, industries could adopt the suggestions from the Gildea Resource Centre in Santa Barbara for decreasing the solid waste generated by a final product. These strategies include:

- increasing the product's durability, longevity and ability to be repaired;
- redesigning the product to generate less waste;
- packaging to increase the life span of product and minimize waste.

RECOMMENDATION # 38:

To reduce solid waste generation, industries should:

a) introduce a "4Rs" waste minimization program of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order, to minimize the solid waste they produce in their operations;

b) redesign their products to increase their durability, longevity, and ability to be repaired to minimize the solid waste produced by consumer-used goods.

6. Procurement Policies:

Another way industries can assist in reducing the municipal solid waste stream is to develop procurement policies which promote markets for materials favouring the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. Industries which have agreed to fund OMMRI II have already agreed to review their purchasing practices to encourage the use of products containing recycled materials. Comprehensive procurement policies would go much further. They could, for example, include the use of re-refined oil, recycled paper and products with reduced packaging. By making these changes, industry could help to provide markets for materials which are being source separated, reduced, or otherwise meeting waste minimization goals.

RECOMMENDATION # 39:

Industries should develop comprehensive procurement policies which promote goods favouring the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

PROVINCIAL FUNDING OF INDUSTRY:

The Ministry of the Environment has an Industrial "4Rs" Initiative to fund industries which implement practices to reduce, reuse and recycle industrial and commercial waste. Introduced in June 1987, the program had a 1989/1990 budget allocation of $6.5 million to fund such projects as feasibility studies, reduction, reuse, recycling or recovery of wastes, process or equipment modification or evaluation, technology demonstration, research, and the upgrading of existing operations beyond current state-of-the-art technology for a particular industry. The amount of funding available ranges from 50 to 100 per cent, depending on the type of project. (See Appendix B for details.)

AMO recognizes that this program provides an opportunity for industry to review the "4Rs" activities regarding its materials and end products. However, AMO is concerned that the program only addresses the creation of waste in the production process. To be more effective, the program could be expanded to encourages industries to review the material used in their products to ensure these also meet the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

PART V

THE PUBLIC

ROLES:

Public concern about the environment has been growing. Public participation in Ontario's Blue Box recycling program has shown that many people want to help to reduce the municipal solid waste stream. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario believes it is important for the public to be involved in this endeavour. The public, like governments and industry, has helped to create the growing solid waste stream and it is only through everyone's active participation that the waste stream will be reduced.

ACTIVITIES:

Public activities to reduce the municipal solid waste stream have been varied. Some people have been very involved in reusing and recycling their own solid waste; others have done nothing. As more governments become involved in this area and begin to introduce programs ranging from municipal recycling to package reduction and user-pay fees, that may all change.

Individuals who wish to reduce their share of the waste stream can find ways to do so. Within their own homes and offices, they can practice most of the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. This could involve such activities as:

- refusing to buy products with excess packaging;
- replacing plastic grocery bags with cloth bags;
- using ceramic mugs rather than paper cups;
- taking used clothing to charitable organizations rather than throwing it in the garbage;
- giving egg cartons to farmers selling eggs so they can reuse them;
- buying products with recycled material whenever possible;
- participating in recycling programs where they are available;
- starting a home composting program.

These are only a few ways individuals can reduce their 1.7 kilogram per day contribution to Canada's municipal solid waste stream. Other ideas can be gained by contacting: the municipality which is in charge of waste management in your area, a local environmental organization, or such Toronto-based groups as The Recycling Council of Ontario and Pollution Probe. Beyond that, the key to reducing the municipal solid waste stream is awareness that every person's effort is very important.

PART VI

DEFINITIONS

- Municipal solid waste: material which is managed through the municipal solid waste management system.

- Reduction: the creation of products, packaging or other goods with less material.

- Reuse: waste material which can be used again in the same form for the same purpose by the source, production process, or end user.

- Recycling: the separation of waste material and reintroduction of it back into the production process.

- Recovery: a synonym for waste incineration where energy is gained from burning waste.

- Waste Audit: analysis of a government or business operation with the aim of minimizing or eliminating the waste.

TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Page

RECOMMENDATION #1: 11

a) The federal government should develop, in concert with representatives of other government levels and waste generators, a comprehensive national program to support the management of solid waste.

b) Representatives of the municipal sector of government should be included in the multi-party working group which develops this program.

RECOMMENDATION #2: 12

The federal government should:

a) adopt a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery to accompany its waste reduction targets;

b) encourage, as part of this hierarchy, programs which promote the reduction of materials which would otherwise be considered as waste;

c) help to develop markets for recyclable materials and mechanisms to ensure those markets.

RECOMMENDATION #3: 13

The federal government should conduct more research and development projects for environmental issues and technologies which cross provincial and international boundaries. Information from these projects should be disseminated to municipalities.

RECOMMENDATION #4: 14

The federal government should promote a Canadian environmental industry and make the technological advances available to Canadian municipalities.

Page

RECOMMENDATION #5: 14

The federal government should establish a national resource centre which would allow those interested in this area to access all available information on solid waste and its management from one central source. This centre should collect, compile and catalogue appropriate information in this area and disseminate information on its inventory to those wishing to access this.

RECOMMENDATION #6: 15

The federal government should adopt comprehensive procurement policies which promote goods and services favouring the first "3Rs" of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy. These procurement policies should apply to all federal departments, agencies, boards and crown corporations and be enacted in legislation.

RECOMMENDATION #7: 16

The federal government's Environmental Choice "EcoLogo" program should be expanded and should also include a label which indicates whether a material should be reused, recycled, treated as a hazardous waste, or disposed of in an environmentally safe manner.

RECOMMENDATION #8: 17

The federal and provincial governments should regulate firm dates by which the National Packaging Protocol's targets must be met by companies and enforce compliance.

RECOMMENDATION #9: 17

The Canadian Council of Ministers on the Environment (CCME) should use the National Packaging Protocol as a model to address other components of the municipal solid waste stream. A starting point for this could be fine paper, magazines and advertising flyers.

Page

RECOMMENDATION #10: 19

The municipal sector of government should be included as a member of the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy since it is addressing solid waste management matters which have traditionally been dealt with by municipalities.

RECOMMENDATION #11: 20

The federal government should provide increased funding to those agencies which are carrying out programs of national significance related to solid waste.

RECOMMENDATION #12: 23

The Ontario government should:

a) use the Environmental Assessment process, including public consultation, to develop generic guidelines relative to waste diversion for municipalities;

b) adopt and publish an official policy, or pass legislation which formally enshrines its provincial waste diversion goals;

c) develop methods to record progress toward these goals, state what the year of comparison is to be, and state what can and cannot be counted for meeting those diversion targets;

d) develop, in concert with municipalities, implementation guidelines to meet these targets;

e) specify what percentage of the waste diversion goal it will take exclusive responsibility for. This should only include the areas of reduction and reuse, and not include any activities in which Ontario municipalities are, or will be, partners.

RECOMMENDATION #13: 24

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment should adopt a "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order, to accompany its waste reduction targets.

Page

RECOMMENDATION #14: 24

The Ontario government should immediately release its solid waste abatement strategy for consultation.

RECOMMENDATION #15: 25

The Ontario government should reconstitute the Recycling Advisory Committee with a new name, mandate and multi-stake-holder membership which reflects the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy.

RECOMMENDATION #16: 28

The Ontario government should:

a) develop and implement material use and procurement policies which reflect the "4Rs" waste management hierarchy;

b) immediately extend its material use and procurement policies and recycling programs to all the buildings it occupies, as well as all provincial ministries, agencies, boards and crown corporations;

c) consider co-tendering with municipalities for projects which would assist public agencies in meeting waste reduction targets.

RECOMMENDATION #17: 29

The Minister of the Environment should recognize that policy-making by press release is not acceptable. Policy should be developed through consultation and with discussion papers and should result in policy statements before the legislation is announced. Regulations should promptly follow the legislation.

RECOMMENDATION #18: 30

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment should fund the hiring of a municipal solid waste management information co-ordinator, with that person working in AMO's offices. The information co-ordinator would improve communication in this area among municipalities, and between municipalities and the provincial government.

Page

RECOMMENDATION #19: 33

The Ministry of the Environment should immediately release its province-wide waste composition study. Then it should:

a) identify which industries produce the most materials entering landfills;

b) require these industries to develop a "4Rs" policy, based on the waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling, and recovery, to reduce solid waste in accordance with Ontario's waste reduction goals;

c) make compliance voluntary but develop and enforce regulations if that does not work.

RECOMMENDATION #20: 34

In developing the Ontario share of the National Packaging Protocol strategy, the Ontario government should:

a) include a municipal government representative on its multi-stakeholder advisory group;

b) introduce regulations to ensure the National Packaging Protocol's targets for reducing packaging waste are met.

The Ontario government should also urge the federal government to use the National Packaging Protocol model to reduce other components of Canada's solid waste stream.

RECOMMENDATION #21: 37

To strengthen its OMMRI II program, the Ontario government should:

a) encourage industry to adopt the "4R" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery to divert its solid waste;

b) include municipalities in discussions regarding industry-provincial municipal waste minimization strategies which impact them or the solid waste stream they manage;

c) continue to assist with the development of markets for recyclable materials;

Page

d) ensure the Ontario government and industry provide long-term funding for the Blue Box recycling programs which they initiated. This funding should continue to be one-third of the total cost for each partner, and should be available for as long as revenue from selling recyclables fails to cover the costs of recycling programs.

RECOMMENDATION #22: 38

The Ontario government should:

a) reject the Recycling Advisory Council's recommendation to eliminate the provincial requirement for soft drink producers to provide at least 30 per cent of their products in refillable containers;

b) continue to encourage reuse as an important component of waste management.

c) encourage people to become aware that recyclable bottles are better for reuse.

RECOMMENDATION #23: 39

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment should:

a) strengthen the regulations requiring soft drink containers to be refillable. It should also extend these to cover all beverage containers;

b) ensure a deposit system is instituted for all beverage containers.

RECOMMENDATION #24: 43

The Ontario government should provide funding which reflects a "4Rs" waste management hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order.

Page

RECOMMENDATION #25: 44

The Ministry of the Environment should improve its funding programs by:

a) eliminating the words "up to" in the grant programs;

b) telling municipalities how much money is in a particular fund, and when that money has been depleted;

c) instituting an announced time limit in which to reply to municipalities;

d) increasing the amount of funding going into the total package.

RECOMMENDATION #26: 45

The Ontario government should:

a) clarify its stand on energy-from-waste so municipalities know whether it is, or is not, an acceptable waste management practice;

b) extend the energy-from-waste Capital Assistance Program's funding beyond 1992.

RECOMMENDATION #27: 49

The Ontario government should:

a) review all municipal legislation for regional municipalities, counties and local municipalities where counties have not opted to take responsibility for waste management. The review and resulting legislative amendments would ensure that each municipality has sufficient waste management authority for reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery of waste projects. The resulting amendments should also result in municipalities being able to delegate final facility siting decisions to county or regional municipalities with no appeal process for an area municipality;

b) amend The Municipal Act (section 208, paragraph 5) to explicitly give municipalities contemplating the waste management master plan, where Bill 201 is not applicable, the authority to include land acquisition for waste management purposes in inter-municipal agreements and the authority to agree to forego their right (under The Municipal Act, Section 210, paragraph 84) to approve any land acquisition within their boundaries for waste disposal purposes if they subsequently chose to opt out of the waste management master planning unit;

c) create legislation with an efficient and fair procedure to allow proponents to enter and use private property for waste management planning studies. Municipal authority provided by this amendment could be used where property owners refuse consent to those wishing to enter their premises for these studies.

RECOMMENDATION #28: 50

Municipalities should review their governing legislation and ask the province to make the necessary legislative changes to allow them the authority to implement the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

RECOMMENDATION #29: 51

All Ontario municipalities should introduce an integrated solid waste management plan which incorporates the "4Rs" of the waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery as well as the more traditional activities of collection and disposal.

RECOMMENDATION #30: 51

Every Ontario municipal government should conduct a waste audit to reduce its own solid waste generation.

RECOMMENDATION #31: 52

All Ontario municipal governments should introduce comprehensive procurement policies which promote the use of products favouring the first 3Rs of the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

Page

RECOMMENDATION #32: 53

a) Municipalities, with the provincial government's assistance, should help commercial waste haulers and their customers, the waste producers, find "4Rs" alternatives for their materials.

b) Prior to banning certain commercial materials at municipal landfill sites, municipalities should give commercial waste hauliers sufficient notice that the ban is going to be implemented.

c) All Ontario municipalities should ban the dumping of recyclable materials in their landfills where appropriate markets for these goods are available.

RECOMMENDATION #33: 53

Ontario municipalities should be given authority to approve the establishment and continued use of private waste disposal systems in their jurisdiction in order to better manage the solid waste stream.

RECOMMENDATION #34: 55

Municipalities should investigate co-operative ventures, such as joint boards of management, to implement integrated waste management programs for a particular area.

RECOMMENDATION #35: 55

Municipalities should include in audits of their waste management systems information which would provide them with a true cost accounting of their solid waste management system.

RECOMMENDATION #36: 56

All Ontario municipalities should:

a) set their tipping fees so these reflect the total life-cycle cost of operating their solid waste management systems;

b) dedicate the revenue from tipping fees to fund their integrated waste management system.

Page

RECOMMENDATION # 37: 60

Industries should conduct waste audits of their operations to reduce the solid waste which they produce.

RECOMMENDATION # 38: 61

To reduce solid waste generation, industries should:

a) introduce a "4Rs" waste minimization program of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery, in that order, to minimize the solid waste they produce in their operations;

b) redesign their products to increase their durability, longevity, and ability to be repaired to minimize the solid waste produced by consumer-used goods.

RECOMMENDATION # 39: 62

Industries should develop comprehensive procurement policies which promote goods favouring the "4Rs" waste minimization hierarchy of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery.

APPENDIX A

FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

The federal Ministry of the Environment funds two projects which can directly impact municipal solid waste management. The first provides money to municipalities which meet the program criteria.

1. **DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF RESOURCE AND ENERGY CONSERVATION TECHNOLOGY (DRECT):**

   Grant: Funded by Environment Canada and Energy, Mines and Resources Canada.

   Purpose: To provide federal funds to develop new or innovative technology which recovers, recycles or reuses products from the waste stream. The project must also save energy.

   Government Allocation: The program began in about 1980 and in 1989/90 had a $1 million budget.

   Terms: The grant has primarily been used by private industry, but municipalities are eligible if they have new projects which decrease pollution and recover energy.

   Funding Available: Funding is for up to 50 per cent of the total estimated costs of an approved project. This includes most capital and operating costs, but usually excludes land and buildings. The average funding is for 20 per cent to 30 per cent of a project's costs.

The second project provides money to organizations which municipalities may be working with to operate solid waste management projects.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERS FUND:

Grant: Funded by Environment Canada.

Purpose: To provide federal funds to stimulate community involvement in projects which protect, preserve or enhance the environment.

Government Allocation: The program began in 1989 and has a budget of $50 million for five years. Of this, $40 million is for project funding. Each province or region is allocated a percentage.

Terms: The grant is for community groups, service clubs, environmental organizations, schools and youth groups. Municipalities may work with these as a funding "partner". Many project applications to date have been for recycling and composting. Applications are reviewed by selection committees in five Canadian regions.

Funding Available: Funding is for up to 50 per cent of the total project cost, with a maximum limit of $200,000.

APPENDIX B

PROVINCIAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment provides municipalities with these funding programs.

1. **WASTE MANAGEMENT MASTER PLAN (WMMP):**

Purpose: To provide funds to help municipalities, or groups of municipalities, develop their long-term (20-year) waste management plans, which study all available waste management alternatives for an area.

Government Allocation: The program began in 1982 and in 1989/90 had a budget of $2 million.

Terms: Municipalities which receive this grant must implement the results of their planning process.

Funding Available: The grant is for up to 50 per cent of the cost of developing the plan and there is presently no maximum limit. Costs include consultants' feasibility studies, fulfilling the Environmental Assessment Act's requirements, collecting data, public participation work, and examining options and alternatives. Funds are awarded first to the first applicants.

2. **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (FAP):**

Purpose: To provide municipalities with funds to establish or expand landfills, transfer stations and processing facilities for waste disposal.

Government Allocation: This is a ten-year program which began in 1987/88 and was allocated $8 million in the 1989/90 budget.

Terms: This is for activities ranging from Environmental Assessment Act hearings to construction capital costs. Funds are available for a period of up to five years.

Funding Available: Project funding ranges from 50 per cent to 75 per cent, with more funds given to smaller municipalities. Applications are rated according to planning, existing or potential health and environmental problems, remaining capacity, waste diversion and municipal growth. Those with the highest ratings get all of their grants first.

3. WASTE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (WMIP):

Purpose: To provide funds for "needy" municipalities to upgrade existing sites, close sites, do investigative studies and provide remedial measures at active sites.

Government Allocation: This program began in 1977 and the province allocated $3.15 million to it in 1989/90.

Terms: Municipalities which apply for funds are ranked by need, with more points given to projects needing leachate or methane controls than those needing fences or cover material.

Funding Available: From 50 per cent to 75 per cent of a project's cost will be funded, with smaller municipalities getting the largest percentage. However, the budget is divided to aid municipalities of all sizes, so those which have more people and are also considered "in need" will be able to get funds for one year.

4. MUNICIPAL RECYCLING SUPPORT PROGRAM (MRSP):

Purpose: To provide funds to help municipalities and industry start recycling programs. The Ministry defines recycling as separating waste at source so it can be reused. The program has seven grant types.

Government Allocation: In 1986, the government vastly expanded its five-year-old Source Separation Program to start MRSP. Its 1989/90 budget was $6.405 million in capital and $5 million for operation funds.

Terms: All grants are available to both municipalities and private sector.

a) **Operating Cost Grant:**

Purpose: To provide a decreasing level of operating cost support over a five year period to help municipalities and other recyclers start recycling programs.

Amount: The grant is for up to 50 per cent of operating costs in year one, 40 per cent in year two, 30 per cent in year three, 20 per cent in year four, 10 per cent in year five, and zero for year six and thereafter.

b) **Capital Cost Grant:**

Purpose: To provide up to five years of support for a project's plant and equipment costs.

Amount: The grant pays one-third of a project's building and equipment capital costs. The Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc. (OMMRI) pays one-third of equipment costs only and the municipality pays the balance.

c) **Household Recycling Bins:**

Purpose: To fund part of the cost for household recycling bins, better known as Blue Boxes.

Amount: The grant will pay up to one-third of the cost of one bin per household. Grants for replacement bins are also available at a rate of two per cent per year for up to five years. OMMRI pays one-third of the cost, the municipality pays the other third.

d) **Promotion/Advertising Grant:**

Purpose: To provide funds to promote and advertise local recycling projects.

Amount: The grant pays up to 50 per cent of the cost of designing, producing and distributing promotion and advertising material. Maximum limit is 10 cents per capita per year for up to 5 years.

e) **Education grants:**

Purpose: To provide funds to support educational projects which raise the awareness and understanding of reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. This is to encourage a wider knowledge of recycling than day-to-day communications programs can provide.

Amount: The grant is for up to $15,000.

f) **Demonstration Grants:**

Purpose: To encourage new, more efficient waste collection and handling methods and the development of new market approaches.

Amount: The grant will pay up to 100 per cent of the cost of demonstration projects, studies and pilot projects which advance recycling technology.

g) **Feasibility Study Grants:**

Purpose: To provide funds to pay the cost of hiring a consultant to prepare for a feasibility study when it is needed for Operating and Capital Cost grant applications.

Amount: The grant pays up to 50 per cent of eligible study costs.

5. **STUDENT ACTION FOR RECYCLING (STAR):**

Purpose: To support school boards wishing to promote recycling and to increase student awareness of, and involvement in, waste management.

Allocation: This program began in October 1989 and money for it is allocated in the MRSP budget (see #4).

Terms: School boards apply for this grant and most of the money is for their recycling program's capital and salary costs. However, the program is intended to be operated with a local municipal recycling program. Municipalities may apply for funds to buy a special collection vehicle(s) to serve the school board.

Funding: Municipalities may receive up to 100 per cent of the cost of a collection vehicle(s) just to serve the school board. School boards are eligible for funds to cover 2/3 of their capital costs for collection, storage, construction and safety equipment. They may also receive 1/2 of a co-ordinator's salary, up to a maximum of $20,000, for the first year.

6. MUNICIPAL RECOVERY PROGRAM (MRP):

Purpose: To encourage municipalities to recover useful materials not already taken from the waste stream by consumer recycling and prevent these from being disposed of in landfill sites. Compostable waste, glass, plastic, aluminum, steel, paper and other mixed waste can be recovered.

Allocation: The 1989/90 budget allocation was $600,000.

Terms: All municipalities or groups of municipalities are eligible for funding. Private sector proposals must be submitted through the municipality.

Funding Available:

a) Demonstration Grant: municipalities may receive up to 100 per cent of the cost of demonstrating a project.

b) Capital Grant: municipalities may also receive up to one-third of the capital cost of developing and starting a facility. This includes the cost of feasibility studies, and designing, approving, constructing and commissioning a project.

7. MUNICIPAL REDUCTION/REUSE PROGRAM (MRRP):

Purpose: To provide municipalities and industry with funds to implement projects which encourage consumer awareness of reusing and reducing waste so it does not need treatment and disposal. This includes home composting, packaging and new product approaches.

Allocation: The 1989/90 budget for this was $130,000.

Terms: Capital projects will only be considered through municipalities.

Funding Available: Applicants may receive up to 50 per cent of promotion and advertising costs and up to 50 per cent of capital costs incurred by municipalities. Development of creative projects or materials, such as educational pamphlets, may be funded up to 100 per cent, with a limit of $25,000 per project.

8. HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM (HHWP):

Purpose: To provide funds for disposal of hazardous household waste through day or weekend household hazardous waste collection projects. These encourage householders to bring hazardous wastes to a specific location so they will not enter the landfill and sewage systems.

Allocation: The program began in 1986 and was revamped on April 1, 1989. The budget was recently increased from $250,000 to $1 million.

Terms: Municipalities, community associations and unorganized settlements may apply for funds. Preference is given to first-time applicants and additional funds are available for those who divert oil and paint from disposal to reuse and re-refining. Municipalities may also receive up to 50 per cent of the capital cost for a permanent depot under the FAP program. (see #2.)

Funding: The program will pay 50 per cent of the operating costs, up to a maximum of $5,000, for up to two special waste days or weekends held in one year. Applicants who recycle paint and oil are eligible for up to an additional $10,000.

These programs have been available for some years, but the Ministry of the Environment also introduced a new funding program on March 14, 1990.

9. THE ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM (ETP):

Purpose: To stimulate development of new products and processes which protect the environment.

Allocation: The program begins in 1990 and has a budget of $30 million spread over five years.

Terms: It will fund up to 50 per cent of projects proposed by Canadian companies, universities, research organizations, municipalities, conservation authorities or public interest groups. The money is to help cover costs of researching, developing and testing products or processes. Funding is also available for full-scale field trials and technical demonstrations of new environmental technologies. Eligible products and processes include technologies which: eliminate or reduce emissions to air or discharges to water; reduce municipal, commercial and industrial waste using the 3Rs of reduce, reuse and recycle; develop spill containment and cleanup technologies; develop improved monitoring and analytical methods and techniques. The Ontario government is particularly interested in projects which:

a) prevent or reduce pollution at source;

b) help municipalities and industries meet emission and discharge levels set by the provincial cleanup program;

c) meet objectives set by the Ontario Round Table on the Environment and the Economy.

Funding: Funding is available for up to a maximum of $500,000 per year for a maximum of three years.

The Ontario Ministry of Energy provides one funding program for energy-from-waste projects.

10. CAPITAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM:

Purpose: To provide capital funds to encourage energy-from-waste projects. Energy-from-waste is a process of burning non-toxic waste to create heat or electricity.

Government Allocation: $25 million for 5 years, starting in 1987.

Terms: Municipalities may receive funds for capital costs, but they must have an Environmental Assessment approval before applying for a grant.

Funding Available: 15 per cent of the project's capital costs, up to a maximum of $6 million.

The Ministry of the Environment also has an Industrial "4Rs" Initiative.

11. INDUSTRIAL 4Rs INITIATIVE:

Purpose: To encourage industries to implement practices which reduce, reuse and recycle industrial and commercial waste.

Government Allocation: The program began in June 1987 and had a 1989/90 budget allocation of $6.5 million.

Terms: The program funds such projects as feasibility studies, reduction, reuse, recycling or recovery of wastes, process or equipment modification or evaluation, technology demonstration, research, and the upgrading of existing operations beyond current state-of-the-art technology for a particular industry.

Funding Available:

a) For capital costs, the grant is to match the proponent's dollar contribution up to a maximum of 50 per cent of the total eligible cost.

b) For start-up costs, the grant is for up to a maximum of 50 per cent of the cost.

c) For demonstration or evaluation of a technology or process, the grant is for up to 100 per cent of a proponent's eligible costs for a defined time needed to demonstrate and/or evaluate the proposal.

d) For research, the grant is for up to 100 per cent of eligible costs.

APPENDIX C

MINORITY REPORTS FROM AMO'S COMMITTEES

AMO's third waste management report, Municipal Solid Waste Management: Whose Problem Is It?, was developed by the association's Ad Hoc Waste Management Committee, and then reviewed by AMO's Municipal Development Committee, Section Executive Committees and Executive Committee.

Many of those committees' comments were incorporated into the report; a few were not. What follows are the committee comments which were not incorporated.

AMO Municipal Development Committee:

RECOMMENDATION #11:

The committee was concerned about AMO's relationship with the federal government. Should AMO go through FCM to have its opinion heard on this recommendation or should AMO deal directly with the federal government? MDC suggested the committee should verify whether AMO's position on this point is in conflict with FCM's.

RECOMMENDATION #18:

The committee recommended that instead of asking for an information co-ordinator, AMO should request a data bank computer software system which could serve as a centrally computerized information-sharing bank.

RECOMMENDATION #37:

Replace the word "should" with "must" and provide a lead time for industries to accomplish these tasks.

County and Regional Executive Committee:

RECOMMENDATION #18:

The County and Regional Executive Committee did not support this recommendation. Its members agreed there was an information gap and lack of information co-ordination on waste management policy. However, they said a "coordinator" working from the AMO's office could not fill municipalities' needs. The committee said the waste management issue is not comparable to the energy conservation issue and is perhaps too "politicized" and unique to local circumstances for one information coordinator to effectively assist municipalities.

RECOMMENDATION #36:

The County and Regional Executive Committee supported the recommendation as amended with the deletion of part b). The committee did not support the idea of "dedicated" user fees.

USER FEES:

The Committee noted that the AMO Ad Hoc Waste Management Committee did not yet have a recommendation regarding user fees. The County and Regional Executive Committee recommended:

a) that the committee examine and include in the text the California experience of fees for curbside pick-up, with the householder receiving a bill which would be similar to a utility bill.

b) the addition of the following:

"The association encourages municipalities to consider householder user fees for garbage collection as one method of reducing the amount of waste for landfill."

Large Urban Executive Committee:

PART I: FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

a) The waste management committee should consider whether the philosophy of its report is to:

1) cut the amount of garbage going to landfill sites, or

2) deal with garbage in the most environmental way possible?

Once the philosophy is settled, it should be addressed in the report.

b) The committee could consider whether there is a role for the National Research Council in this part of the report.

c) The report could also deal with the environmental impact of companies which leave Canada and move to other countries with fewer environmental standards.

One suggestion was to recommend that the federal government be urged to encourage developed countries to press for uniform environmental laws around the world. Developed countries could also encourage developing countries to adopt such environmental laws.

A second suggestion was to urge the federal government to adopt environmental standards that companies which have moved elsewhere must meet before they can send their goods back to Canada.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The federal government should institute boards, such as the farm marketing boards, to promote markets for recyclable materials. The federal government should also do more to examine the impact which off-shore markets have on this area in Canada.

RECOMMENDATION #25:

The committee noted the report says municipalities do not want the province to unload recycling programs on them, then asks the province for more money for these programs. It asked the waste management committee to check whether this was consistent with what AMO had previously said.

RECOMMENDATION #33:

The committee recommended that the provincial government accept financial responsibility where there are existing landfill sites and where MISA legislation has been contravened.

RECOMMENDATION #35:

The report should provide more information on a financial model for audits of municipal waste management systems.

Rural Executive Committee:

No specific comments were made on the paper. There was one comment that there was perhaps not enough emphasis on the consumer. Citizens have a fundamental role to play, and the solution lies in the more active participation of society as a whole.

ENDNOTES

1. The Minister of the Environment, The Green Plan: A Framework for Discussion on the Environment, Supply and Services Canada, 1990, p. 1.

2. Ibid., p. 17.

3. Municipal Solid Waste Task Force, The Solid Waste Dilemma: An Agenda for Action, Office of Solid Waste, The United States Environmental Protection Agency, February 1989, introduction.

4. The World Commission on Environment and Development, Our Common Future, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988, p. 43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A comprehensive bibliography of the material used to compile this report is available from the office of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. To order copies, please see the inside of the back cover for the association's address.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario would like to thank the members of its Ad Hoc Waste Management Committee who volunteered their time to produce this document. It also wishes to thank the AMO staff who worked with the committee to develop this report. The members of the team were:

Ms. Eileen Smith
Regional Councillor
Regional Municipality of
Haldimand-Norfolk

Mr. Gary Cousins
Director of Planning
County of Wellington

Mr. Michael Fenn
City Manager
City of Burlington

Mr. Don Markle
Commissioner of Public Works
Regional Municipality of Peel

Mr. Stan Pettit
Regional Councillor
Regional Municipality of Niagara

Mr. P. Jeffery Seaton
County Engineer
County of Victoria

Mr. Walter Scudds
Reeve
Village of Hastings

Mr. David Smith
Waste Management Engineer
City of St. Catharines

Ms. Isabel Turner
Reeve
Township of Kingston

Mr. Jim Wales
Reeve
Township of Tosorontio

Staff

Noelle Boughton
Policy Analyst

PUBLICATIONS ISSUED IN THE "AMO REPORT" SERIES

88-1	Education Funding in Ontario
88-2	Preliminary Response to New Directions for Child Care
88-3	1988 Provincial Budget Submission
88-4	AMO Submission to Provincial Cabinet
88-5	AMO Response to the Report of the Advisory Committee on County Government: "Patterns for the Future"
88-6	Pressures on the Partnership: Response to the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Discussion Paper
88-7	AMO's Unconditional Grants Proposal for 1989
88-8	AMO's Response to "Rental Housing Protection Act: Future Directions"
88-9	Municipal Authority to Regulate Occupancy on the Basis of Relationship
88-10	AMO Response to Bill 170 - Aggregates Resources Act
88-11	AMO Position on "Controlling Industrial Discharges to Sewers"
88-12	AMO Response to "A Review of the Conservation Authorities Program"
88-13	AMO Response to Bill 174, The Intervenor Funding Project
89-1	AMO Brief to the Province of Ontario: 1989-90 Transfer Payment Announcement
89-2	AMO Response to "Financing Growth-related Capital Needs"
89-3	AMO Report on the Draft Housing Policy Statement
89-4	Property Tax: a Provincial Tax? AMO Presentation to the Standing Committee of Finance and Economic Affairs
89-5	"Salvaging the Partnership": 1989 AMO Provincial Submission to Cabinet
89-6	Response to "Transitions", The Report of the Social Assistance Review Committee
89-7	Review of Bill 20 - An Act to provide for the Payment of Development Charges
89-8	Response to "County Government in Ontario"
89-9	Response to Draft Wetlands Planning Policy Statement
90-1	"A New Decade - A New Partnership"
90-2	Bill 107: The Police Services Act
90-3	"New Dimensions": Report of AMO Conditional Grants Review ($25)
90-4	"Reforming the Partnership": AMO Submission to Provincial Cabinet
•	AMO Waste Management Study: The Waste Management Planning and Approvals Process ($15)
•	AMO Waste Management Study: The Municipal Waste Abatement Strategy
•	AMO Waste Management Crisis: A Shared Responsibility Brief to Provincial/Municipal Policy Forum
•	AMO Waste Management Study: Municipal Solid Waste Management - Whose Problem Is It? ($15)
•	AMO Financial Survey - Descriptive Report: Impact of Provincial and Federal Policies on 1989 and 1990 Municipal Budgets

Copies of all of the reports in this series are available, prepaid, at $10.00 each (except where otherwise noted) for postage and handling. Please send cheques, payable to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, to Publications Centre, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, 100 University Avenue, Suite 805, Toronto, Ontario, M5J 1V6.